

The Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER is now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.
 The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s. Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 5s.

* We must draw the attention of correspondents to the rule that all letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH, 7, 1874.

THE PAMPHLET JUST ISSUED on the proposed (or apprehended) Judicature Bill for Ireland, which bears the signature of Lord Justice Christian, is entitled to the most careful consideration, not only from the deference due to the exalted rank and distinguished character of the writer, but also on account of the weight and importance of the suggestions which it contains. We pass entirely over that portion of it which consists in a personal attack upon Lord O'Hagan, with an expression of our regret that the learned author should have thought it consistent with the dignity of his position, or likely to add weight to his arguments, to condescend to point his moral by a virulent personal attack of this nature. We are far from suggesting that the Lord Justice's persistent opposition to his late colleague was in any manner excited or augmented by personal or professional jealousy; yet those who remember that Lord Palmerston's Solicitor-General had been so exceptionally distinguished as an equity lawyer, that his elevation by Lord Derby from the uncongenial atmosphere of the Common Pleas to the post of Lord Justice of Appeal in Chancery was received with acclamation by the whole profession, may perhaps be excused if they should think it neither improbable nor unnatural that the promotion of a pure common law lawyer, however distinguished, to the office of Lord Chancellor, should have left in his mind some feeling of irritation and disappointment. We at the time (13 S. J. 107) expressed our opinion with reference to this appointment, and have no desire to recur to the subject; but we deprecate most earnestly, as *passim exempli*, any attempt to affect the course of a great constitutional reform by considerations turning merely upon the *personnel* of its first administrators.

Apart from this personal question (which occupies some 10 pages out of the 58 of which the pamphlet consists) there remain some very important considerations, urged with all the force and precision of which the right hon. judge is so distinguished a master, which will, we trust, not be overlooked by those upon whom the duty will now be cast of preparing the measure to be introduced for perfecting the judicial reform of last year. If our readers will do us the favour to turn to our remarks upon Lord Hatherley's Court of Appeal Bill (16 S. J. 458, 478) they will see that the view we then advocated has now received, in its most essential particulars, the sanction of the high authority of the writer of this pamphlet.

THE TRIAL of what have been termed "Plimsoil cases" at the last sittings at Guildhall has certainly not proved encouraging to underwriters. For several days during the short fortnight which is given to the London sittings after term, three of the courts were blocked with the trial of cases in which the main question at issue was the seaworthiness of ships: but only in one instance (*Smith v. Kirby*) did the allegation of unseaworthiness meet with any success, and then only to the limited extent of dividing the

jury. In both the other cases (*Brown v. The Thames and Mersey Insurance Company* and *Wilson v. The Maritime Insurance Company*) in which the underwriters raised this defence, the issue of unseaworthiness was found by the jury in favour of the assured. In these last-named cases the policy sued upon was a time-policy, in which there is of course no warranty of seaworthiness, as in a voyage policy (*Gibson v. Small*, 4 H. L. Cas. 353), but a defence was raised similar to that in the plea held good in *Thompson v. Hopper* (4 W. R. 360, 6 E. & B. 172), that the ship insured was unseaworthy at the commencement of the voyage on which she was lost, that the plaintiffs (the assured) knowingly and wilfully sent her to sea in an unseaworthy state, and that by reason of the premises she was lost.

It is rather disappointing that, by the findings of the juries in these cases, the opportunity has been lost of a further discussion of the extent to which a shipowner insured in a time policy is responsible for the seaworthiness of his vessel. It is obvious that for a man to send a ship to sea from the port in which he resides, knowing her to be in such a state of unseaworthiness as unfits her for her voyage, is one thing, and for the ship to be sent to sea unseaworthy through the negligence of his agent or stevedore in a foreign port, is another, and between these two cases the facts may shade off to an almost unlimited variety. For the reasons given in *Gibson v. Small*, it would certainly seem that a general warranty of seaworthiness at the commencement of the risk, is impracticable. The ship may be in mid-ocean, and with a storm raging at that very moment. On the other hand it is certainly undesirable, on grounds of public policy, that a system should be encouraged by our law, which makes the underwriter, and not the owner, bear the risk of a ship being sent to sea in an unseaworthy state. No doubt as between the underwriter and the assured it is a mere question of premium; but there are other interests to be considered as well as those of the underwriter; nor indeed is it desirable that the honest and careful owner should be compelled by a higher standard of premium to suffer for the risks occasioned by others with fewer scruples or less caution. Neither by the decision in *Thompson v. Hopper*, which was argued on demurrer, nor by that of *Fawcus v. Sarsfield* (6 E. & B. 192), decided in the same year, is the law on the subject put upon a very satisfactory footing; and considering the difference of judicial opinion in these cases, as well as in *Gibson v. Small*, it is to be hoped that the subject will shortly undergo further consideration. At present the nearest approach which can be made to a rule seems to be this; that to establish a defence to an action on a time policy, on the ground of unseaworthiness, there must be a wilful sending to sea by the owner equivalent to a scuttling of the ship, though it is not necessary to allege or prove fraud.

ANY PLAINTIFF who wishes to succeed in an action against a railway company should bring it in the Court of Common Pleas, where the doctrine as to the extent to which paternal care should be exercised by railway companies over the indiscretions of their passengers has been carried to the highest pitch. In the recent case of *Weller v. London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company* (22 W. R. 302) it seemed to be the opinion of Brett and Honyman, JJ., that "it is not negligence to call out before the train stopped, nor was it negligence that the driver overshot the station; but the two together do amount to evidence of negligence." This seems strange reasoning. The notion that merely calling out the name of a station before the train has stopped is evidence of negligence was abandoned even by Willes, J., in *Bridges v. London and North Western Railway Company* (19 W. R. 825, L. R. 6 Q. B. 377). But if this is not negligence, it cannot become so by reason of the train overshooting the platform; unless it is to be said that the porter who calls out the name of the station is bound to have so nice an eye that he ought to know

whether the train will overshoot the platform or no; which would be absurd enough, considering that it is often a question of only a few yards, and that the length of the train is variable. Again, to say that overshooting the platform is negligence, is absurd; considering that when the rails are slippery with wet it is a thing that the most careful engine driver cannot avoid, especially if the train is a heavy one. But if neither circumstance shows negligence separately, neither can the two combined. In the case referred to, however, a circumstance did occur which is clearly brought out only in the judgment of one of the judges, but which is the distinguishing circumstance in the case. "After Mr. Lopes' admission," says Denman, J., "that the question whether there was negligence turned on the point whether there was a final stoppage of the train, I am clear that there was ample evidence from which a jury might find that there was." The learned judge here lays his finger on what does for the first time disclose negligence, and the negligence was not in telling the passenger that the train had arrived at such and such a station, nor in overshooting the platform, but in leaving the train in a place where it was dangerous for the passengers to alight.

WE RECENTLY ADVERTED to the manner in which no less than seventeen statutes are huddled together in the schedule to the Master and Servants Act of 1867. One of the seventeen has lately been brought into odd prominence by the magistrate of the Worship-street Police-court. A working bootmaker had absconded with a pair of boots given to him by his master to make up. Being charged with and confessing the offence, he was sentenced to pay twice the value of the boots, to be levied by distress, or in default to be imprisoned for fourteen days. The magistrate, looking into the Master and Servants Act, 1867, discovered 13 Geo. 2, c. 8, ss. 7, 8, standing in the schedule, and, turning to section 4, found words "which, being unrepealed, made it impossible to deal with the charge in any other way." He added, however, that he would dispense with the punishment of whipping, notwithstanding the words that the offender "shall be likewise whipped in such manner as the justices shall direct." An earlier Act in *pari materia* (9 Geo. 1, c. 27), also scheduled, and also unrepealed, puts it that "the justices are authorised and required . . . to cause the offender to be whipt in the parish or place where the offence shall be committed." But a still earlier Act on the subject of Master and Servant (5 Eliz. c. 4), not scheduled to the Act of 1867, but printed in the revised edition of the statutes contains far stranger things. By this statute "taylor and shoemakers" (*inter alios*) are not to be hired for a less term than one year (section 2), servants in numerous trades are entitled to one quarter's warning (section 4), and are not allowed to leave the parish where they have served without a "testimonial," to be written and registered by the parson of the parish (section 7), "and the forme thereof shall bee as folowethe:—mem. that A. B. late servaunte to C. D. of E. husbandman or taylor . . . ys lycensed to departe from his sayed mr and is at his lybertie to serve elsewhere." We wonder how much longer these historically interesting statutes may be expected to remain unrepealed.

ARTHUR ORTON, after sentence, asked leave to say a few words, and was properly refused. Had his offence been felony, and had he not been allowed to speak before sentence, the record would have been bad on writ of error (see *R. v. Geary*, 2 Salk. 630). "In misdemeanours," it is said, "it is not usual to call upon the defendant before judgment" (*Arch. Cr. Pl.*, p. 166). There seems to be no very good reason for this or for any other distinction between felony and misdemeanour, especially since the abolition of forfeiture for felony by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 23. And there would seem to be a very good reason for applying to misdemeanours provisions of 33 & 34 Vict. c. 23, which apply to felons only, such as

condemnation of the convict in costs, and disqualification for offices. If, however, the nominal distinction between felony and misdemeanour be kept up, it may be well to consider whether perjury should not be made felony, if only for the purpose of annexing to a conviction for perjury all the incidents of a conviction for felony which are contained in the valuable statute to which we have referred.

THE TRIAL OF THE CLAIMANT.

In the verdict of guilty, which was pronounced last Saturday, the one bright spot was reached which marks the dreary waste known as the trial of the Claimant. The impostor who was first lifted into notoriety by the untimely and improper attack upon him by an evening paper, and was continued in it by the ill-judged action of the late Chief Justice Bovill in committing him for trial, has at last (with a low and melancholy wail from the Publicans' Friend) vanished behind the prison doors. And we would gladly turn the doors of our memory also on him and all that belongs to him; but, before we part, we must throw one glance back upon the scene of desolation that he has left behind. To all who took any account of the waste of public money, the delay and disturbance of public business, and the withdrawal from more important affairs of some of the highest judicial talent of the country, which this long and dreary trial involved, the case, during its progress, was full of disappointment and regret. They hoped that some happy accident might prevent the indictment from ever being tried; when Mr. Hawkins began they hoped that he would soon finish; when the defendant's counsel began, they hoped the same, with still more desire, but with less expectation; they hoped (and no doubt the prosecution hoped too) that the weight of evidence accumulated against the prisoner would have so far broken down all confidence in his claims as to reduce to a small number those who would still venture to pledge their oaths for him; and when the reply of the defendant's counsel closed, they hoped that the jury would without further delay, return a verdict of guilty. They were always disappointed.

We are fully conscious of the great ability and the long experience which distinguish the eminent counsel who were opposed to the claimant, both on the trial of the cause and on the trial of the indictment, but we entirely refuse to believe that in any cause whatever it can be necessary or expedient, either in the attack or the defence, to heap up evidence and to multiply words as they have been heaped up and multiplied in this case—that it can ever be necessary or expedient to have either speeches or summings-up of from twenty to thirty days' duration. We have no authority to oppose to that of the distinguished men who have committed these excesses, and have furnished posterity with a precedent which we believe to be as injurious as it is novel, but, by the rules of common sense, we decline to accept their warrant for the practice, as we should decline to accept the reasonings of the most acute and accomplished logician which landed us in a preposterous conclusion. Indeed, we cannot conceal from ourselves the conviction that the element of display has had a far greater share in the whole conduct of the case than it ought to have in any trial whatever, above all in the trial of a criminal charge. In ordinary cases, common sense, some consideration of the comparative importance of other matters, and the actual exigency of business, compel the conduct of a cause within stricter limits. In this matter, however, every one seems to have acted (we cannot tell why) as if it had been an admitted principle that everything should give way to it, and that it should give way to nothing; and it is to the removal of all these ordinary restraints that we must ascribe the prodigality of words which will make the two trials a proverb in forensic history. We must challenge the view that any cause,

civil or criminal, is entitled to have this consideration shown to it; that any cause whatever is worth this effort and expenditure to win it; and we do not believe that any court need be forced, or should suffer itself to be seduced, into allowing to any cause so disproportionate a prominence. If a thing is treated as extraordinary it soon becomes so, whatever its original dimensions; but if its exorbitant claims upon attention are resisted, it will shrink to its proper size. Probably no treatment could have made the case short; but it does not admit of doubt that it has been artificially blown up to the enormous figure which it has attained. The revival of the seldom-used form of a trial at bar, the court set apart and sacred to the great cause, and filled with a crowd holding the passes of the judge, the thunderbolts of process for contempt of court launched from time to time among the outside world—all these things gave the proceedings a mock solemnity, and gave also to the vulgar, but shrewd, adventurer far more than the dignity of a prisoner of State. Future times will probably take notice of the trial as the amusement of an idle age.

We should be glad, however, if this trial left behind it no regret but that for wasted time and talents. It is still more to be deplored that a new style of advocacy has been introduced, which the energy and determination of the defence, degenerating into ferocity and recklessness, did but little to relieve, and the faults of which even the incomparable difficulties that surrounded the defendant's case could hardly at all extenuate. All to whom the traditions of the bar are dear must have grieved to see its historical feats parodied, its privileges abused, and its glories tarnished, as they have been in this case. It is not necessary to comment in detail on this unpleasant and distressing feature of the trial, which we cannot believe likely to be ever reproduced; but it is necessary to insist upon it, because it cannot be doubted that it has been the direct cause of what is of far more interest to us than the worst excesses of counsel. Whoever will attempt to realize the acute and daily pain which it must have caused to a judge, himself the greatest of living advocates, and whose advocacy was not less distinguished for its generous and manly honour than for its brilliant eloquence, to see what he could hardly avoid believing to be a laboured scheme of imposture and perjury, not only accepted with absolute credulity by the defendant's counsel, but supported by the most wild and reckless imputations on private character, on the Government of the country, and even on the judicial bench, will readily understand the feelings which sometimes forced from the Lord Chief Justice utterances to which a colder and less generous disposition would not have been tempted. It is easy to require that all perfections shall be united, and that a judge shall not only possess a lucid eloquence, a broad and generous intellect, and a high and incorruptible sense of justice, but that he shall also preside with a uniform judicial calmness and moderation; and it may seem ungenerous when we have so much, to complain that we have not everything. But none the less we must add to the subjects of regret which this trial leaves behind it, the fact that the Bench has too often seemed to occupy a position of antagonism to the defence, that the interpositions from the judges have seemed too uniformly on the side of the Crown, that the summing-up should have presented too much the appearance of a speech for the prosecution, and that it should not only have begun with a censure on the manner and method of the defence, but have ended with an indignant denunciation and a personal vindication. The dramatic element which so highly coloured the whole of this unfortunate case has not failed to penetrate into the highest quarters, and it is matter of the deepest regret that the common usage of criminal trials has been so far departed from.

It is not less a matter of regret that the court should have shown what we conceive to be an undue sensitiveness to the comments of the press, and that the dangerous and arbitrary weapon of process for contempt of Court

should have been so frequently wielded. What difference could it really have made, what possible influence could it have exercised on the minds of the jury, that some provincial papers of limited circulation should have indulged themselves occasionally in expressing their opinions on the question, or that a few fanatical adherents of the defendant should have delivered their views at a public meeting? Did the influence of these things at all approach the influence likely to be exercised by the ceaseless controversy that raged in every region of society, which no juror could possibly escape, unless he were strictly secluded from intercourse with the outer world? With great respect to the Bench, who must have thought otherwise, we conceive that this constituted a far greater interference with the free conduct of the cause in court, and a far more dangerous species of advocacy than the comments of provincial journals; and it was at least unfortunate that the prohibitions of free speech which issued from the court were uniformly addressed to one side. We have already on several occasions drawn attention to the power exercised by the courts in matters of so-called contempt of court, and we observe that in the few words he addressed to the jury Mr. Justice Mellor took occasion to dwell upon the necessity of its existence, and to point out that it was not intended for the aggrandisement of judges, but to arm the court with the means of securing a fair and impartial trial. We have never doubted the excellence of the design, but we venture still to question the necessity and the wisdom of the means, and there is no incident of the late trial which we regard with more regret than the frequent use that has been made of this dangerous weapon. There is a prevailing and increasing feeling that the power of fine and imprisonment, unlimited by any rule, which the courts have by degrees usurped, ought no longer to be left in their hands.

For the rest, as there is much to regret in this cause, so we fear there is nothing to be learnt from it. The legal points which have been raised may have been rightly decided, but it is impossible not to feel that they have been rather overridden than overruled, and it is not too much to say that there is not a single point on which the practice in this case will hereafter be quoted as an authority. The point which is perhaps of the greatest moment, and which is the only one of general importance, is that relating to the postponement of the case for the purpose of allowing rebutting evidence to be, not produced, but procured. As everything in the cause and all its circumstances were peculiar and exceptional, we will not say that it was not a proper thing to do, and the startling annihilation of the most striking part of the defendant's evidence which resulted from the adjournment, will make us unwilling to think that it was wrong. But it is certain that the practice is novel and unheard of; that if it were adopted in ordinary criminal trials it would lead to great and most inconvenient delay and often to injustice; and that in political trials (and we are not to assume that no political trials are ever again to take place before a subservient judge), it would be a ready instrument for the most tyrannical oppression.

Whether we are destined to see the judgment now pronounced challenged in any further proceedings, we cannot tell. For the present, at least, we are glad to find ourselves relieved from the wearisome repetition of the hitherto undistinguished name of Tichborne, and to think that further discussion of the pretender's claims may be left to the pothouse and the cab-rank. For the long bill which the nation will now have to pay, we can scarcely think they have received an equivalent.

Mr. George Young took his seat on the bench in the Court of Session on Tuesday, on his appointment to the vacant judgeship. He sits in the Outer House under the title of Lord Young, Lord Ormisdale being transferred to the Second Division, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Lord Cowan.

THE DOMESTIC JURISDICTION OF THE INNS OF COURT.

The case of *Neate v. Denman*, on which we made some comments last week, though it does not add anything to our store of law (for no one with even the most superficial acquaintance with the subject could for a moment have doubted the result of the demurrer), has nevertheless an importance of its own, which seems to entitle it to more attention than it has as yet met with. The questions, upon what conditions, by what authority, under what control, and with what sanctions, men are to be permitted to enter upon, practise, and relinquish, the profession of advocacy, have of late years been frequently mooted, though in a somewhat partial and isolated manner. The great subject of legal education, indeed, which forms a part of the larger subject above indicated, has for more than twenty years engaged a good deal of public attention, and has lately been taken up by an energetic and powerful association, whose efforts, if not as yet successful to the full extent which we could desire, have already produced considerable alterations in the earlier stages of legal training. But though the law student has thus been cared for, the case of the barrister in actual practice has, hitherto, been practically unattended to, probably, so far as the public are concerned, unknown as well as uncared for, until brought prominently into the light by the case above named. And yet the state of things thus disclosed is very singular and anomalous, and is a remarkable instance of that national idiosyncrasy by which we can tolerate, even admire, any institution, however *a priori* indefensible, if only it has a historical origin and "works well."

The rise, operation, and legal position of the Inns of Court, so far as regards this branch of the subject, may be described in a few words.

At a very early period in our legal history the persons then engaged in practice as advocates before the King's Courts seem to have formed themselves into a sort of friendly society (or trades union), with regulations of their own for the admission of their members to, and their conduct in, not indeed the practice of advocacy but, their own body. As the courts were then attached to the person of the King, and changed their place along with him, this body rather resembled a circuit mess than any other institution of modern days. But when the Court of Common Pleas came to be permanently fixed at Westminster Hall, a new state of things was introduced. The associated advocates, if we may invent a name for them, settled themselves within easy reach of the court, and established a permanent society for mutual convenience and assistance. At what precise time the Serjeants-at-Law, who were then practically the only recognised advocates (though they do not seem ever to have enjoyed an actual monopoly of practice), separated themselves from the "*apprentices de la ley*," and formed themselves into a distinct and exclusive body, we are not certain; but it must have been very shortly after Magna Charter, as we find distinct mention of Serjeant's Inn (*La Societ  de Serjeantz*) as early as the 49 Hen. 3. That these apprentices should form themselves into guilds, governed by their own "*ancientz*," and keeping up their existence by the continual admission of apprentices of their own, was an inevitable consequence of their position, and the spirit of the time. In this respect no legal change has overtaken them from that day to this: the Inns of Court are *in law* nothing more than voluntary associations (clubs) having an immemorial constitution, obedience to which is enforceable against the members by virtue of the contracts into which they enter, first, when admitted as students, and secondly, when called to the bar. As a legal result it follows that the property of each Inn is *in law* the property of its individual members for the time being, and that if these were all to agree at any moment to cease to act as a society, and to divide this property amongst themselves, either equally, or according to any scale of distribution,

no power, short of an Act of Parliament, could intervene to prevent them. Accordingly, we find that when the alterations consequent upon the institution of the Courts of Probate and Divorce had deprived Doctor's Commons of its distinctive usefulness, it was made the subject of discussion amongst the then members of the Faculty of Advocates, whether, under the terms of the Probate Act, they could claim to be treated as a fifth Inn of Court, and it appearing at least doubtful whether that was so or not, it was finally agreed that the property of that body should be sold and divided amongst them, and this was accordingly done.*

But, though we cannot conceive that any of these learned bodies would in fact exercise this right of self-extinction, the privileges which they actually enjoy are not, in theory, one whit less extravagant. The most important of these is the monopoly of admission to the bar. The right of determining who should be entitled to audience must, *ipsa natura rei*, have been originally vested in the judges; and accordingly we find, not only that as matter of fact that was so, but that to this day they are entitled, as visitors, to review the decision of the benchers of any Inn of Court upon any question of admission to or exclusion from the bar. It is well known that within a very few years a gentleman who had been disbarred by the benchers of his Inn was restored to the bar by order of the judges. But when the Inns of Court had become, as we have seen, not merely associations of existing advocates, but places of resort for law students (apprentices) as well, who not only attended the dissertations of the Readers, but themselves tested their fitness for practice by taking part in the moots; the judges, whose time was otherwise fully occupied, and who, separated from both teachers and scholars in the comparative isolation of Serjeants' Inn, knew nothing about the merits of the various candidates for admission to the profession, naturally found it convenient to delegate their authority in this respect to the "ancients" of the several inns, as the persons best qualified, if not the only persons qualified, to judge of the fitness of any particular applicant. That these ancients (the prototypes of the modern benchers) should exercise this delegated authority not arbitrarily but according to certain fixed rules and standards, was an inevitable result of their position; and that one of these rules should at a very early period be that no one should be admitted to practise at the bar by any Inn of Court who was not a member either of that Inn itself or of some Inn of Chancery affiliated thereto, was a necessary consequence of the connection already pointed out, between the undertaking to teach and the authority to admit. Further, the "Guild Spirit," as Mr. Freeman has called it, of the time imposed upon every member of any trade or profession, as between his fellows and the world without, a responsibility and a duty: a responsibility for the credit of the "craft," and a duty of mutual protection "against all others;" and the due discharge of these could only be secured by compelling every member of the craft to continue in the guild so long as he affected to act as craftsman at all. The Inns of Court were no exception to this rule, and hence arose the requirement that every barrister should continue to keep his name on the books of his Inn so long as he continued to practise, or to look for practice, at the bar. That this arrangement, originally common to every trade and business in England, agriculture alone excepted, should have survived to the present day in the case of the bar alone, is an anomaly only to be accounted for upon the ground above-mentioned, that in this particular instance, and this alone, it has continued to "work well." No man in his senses would construct such a system now,

* Another result of this state of things would seem to be that if—as is probable—the result of the Judicature Act should be to put a final stop to the creation of Serjeants-at-Law, the property of Serjeant's Inn will become the subject of a sort of tontine, and the last survivor of the existing serjeants will become entitled to the whole of that property in fee simple, should Parliament not interfere to prevent it.

but that is no more than might be said of almost any other of our most cherished institutions, of the constitution of any of the older universities, or of either of the Houses of Parliament. On the other hand, the fact that it works well is no sufficient justification for the continuance of an anomaly, if it be reasonably probable that a more philosophically defensible system would work equally well, or better; and now that even the ancient corporations are on their trial, it is obvious that such "unauthorised" societies as the Inns of Court must defend their existence, if at all, on the merits.

This brings us to the question which the plaintiff ineffectually attempted to raise in *Neate v. Denman*, which again sub-divides itself into two—viz., 1st. Whether it is or not desirable that barristers in actual practice should be subjected to any authority other than that of the judges? 2ndly. If so, whether any and what authority better than that of the benchers of the several Inns of Court can be devised for the purpose? It will be observed that we have limited the question to the *status* of barristers after their call to the bar, because the position of the Inns as educational bodies depends upon quite different considerations, and there is no inherent necessity that both sets of functions should be combined in the same body. The question, however, even thus limited, is too large to be discussed at the far end of an article, and we must postpone our observations upon it till a future occasion.

CONSTRUCTION OF CONDITIONS OF RE-ENTRY.

In examining the curious piece of construction which is presented by the recent case of *Phillips v. Bridge* (22 W. R. 237, L. R. 9 C. P. 48), we must first see how the law stands on the question of forfeiture for non-payment of rent. 1. At common law there was no right of re-entry for non-payment of rent. 2. If the lease reserved a right of re-entry, the common law stepped in and interposed the necessity of a demand, which, in the interest of the tenant, it made elaborate and burdensome in its formalities; and so the law is still (*Hill v. Kempshall*, 7 C. B. 975; *Barry v. Glover*, 10 I. C. L. Rep. 113). 3. The Legislature, coming to the aid of the landlord, dispensed with the necessity for these formalities, but only in the event of a right of re-entry for non-payment being reserved, of half a year's rent being in arrear, of a declaration in ejectment being served (or a copy affixed to the premises), and of no sufficient distress being found on the premises (4 Geo. 2, c. 28, s. 2, now 15 & 16 Vict. c. 76, s. 210). 4. In the application of this statute it was held (contrary to Lord Ellenborough's opinion) that, since the necessity for a demand was imposed by the common law, since, therefore, its being or not being expressed made no matter before the statute, so it made no matter after; in either case the statute equally applied; so that although he re-entry was to be in case the rent should be in arrear twenty-one days next after the day of payment, being lawfully demanded, yet, the statutory conditions being complied with, the landlord could re-enter without demand (*Doe v. Alexander*, 2 M. & S. 525; *Doe v. Wilson*, 5 B. & A. 363, 384, 394). On the other hand, in order to enable the landlord to take advantage of the statute, it was not only necessary that there should exist a power of re-entry in the lease, but it was also necessary that the power of re-entry should have actually come into effect; that if by the lease days of grace were given for paying, those days must have run out before the declaration could be served (*Doe v. Dixon v. Doe*, 7 C. B. 134). 5. The landlord could, by his contract, secure to himself a still greater freedom of re-entry by providing that he might re-enter without demand, as in *Newdigate's case* (Dyer 68b.), *Doe v. Masters* (2 B. & C. 490), *Kavanagh v. Gudge* (7 M. & G. 316). 6. But where, instead of so providing, the power was to re-enter on the rent not being paid within a certain number of days, being demanded, or being lawfully demanded, it seems to be supposed that some demand other than that required by the common law

will suffice. But what is the authority for this position we have not been able to discover. Lord Ellenborough, indeed, in *Doe v. Alexander*, says that "lawfully demanded does not now mean demanded with all the strictness of the common law, but an effectual demand;" but Lord Ellenborough was then dissenting from the judgment pronounced by the Court, and which was afterwards confirmed by *Doe v. Wilson*, and was concerned to lessen the inconvenience that would result from refusing to allow of the application of the statute. And if his construction had been correct, and the demand stipulated for had been something different from the common law demand, it would seem that his conclusion ought to have been accepted, that the demand so stipulated for was not excluded by the statute. But since, on the contrary, the judgment was otherwise, it seems to follow from this, and from the reasoning of the other judges, that the demand stipulated for was the same demand which the common law implied, and was for that reason equally excluded. *Acocks v. Phillips* (5 H. & N. 183) is an authority against the view referred to; for there, though it was stipulated in the lease that the rent should be "lawfully demanded," the validity of the demand made was tested (and disallowed) by the old common law rules. 7. It may seem strange that a lease should ever be drawn in a form which allows of this question being raised when it is so easy to free the power of re-entry from the necessity of making any demand, a form which, since the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, s. 212, and the Common Law Procedure Act, 1860, s. 1, can inflict no hardship on the tenant. But if a caution against this practice were needed, it is certainly to be found in the case of *Phillips v. Bridge*. The proviso there was that "if the said J. B. shall make default in payment of the said rent or any part thereof within twenty-one days after the same shall become due, being demanded," the landlord might re-enter. It is needless to point out that the sentence is wholly ungrammatical, and perhaps in the case of a forfeiture, the Court would have been justified in saying that they would not find the landlord a meaning. But it is difficult to follow the reasoning by which the Court arrived at the meaning which they did find him, or rather found against him. The cases cited and relied upon in the judgment seem wholly inapplicable, for *Doe v. Dixon* turned entirely on the construction of 4 Geo. 2, c. 28, s. 2, which was here quite out of the question, and *Hill v. Kempshall* turned on the total absence of any stipulation as to a demand, which, not being excluded, the Court held it must be implied, and (the statutory condition not having been fulfilled) the want of a demand prevented the landlord's right of re-entry from arising. The real question simply was, what construction ought to be given to the clause in question; and the Court held that it meant that a demand must be made after the expiration of the twenty-one days' grace. No doubt the words "being demanded" come after the other words of the clause, but on a question of construction this is hardly to be deemed decisive to show that the event they describe is to follow the events previously mentioned. Some regard must be had to the form of the expression. But if a later position in the sentence indicates a later event, then an earlier position indicates an earlier event: the demand is to come after the default; then the default is to come before the demand. The default which is to give the right of re-entry, the only default mentioned, is a default in payment within twenty-one days; that default having already been made, a demand is to be made, but there is no provision that a further default is to be made; so that it would seem the landlord has only to go through the formality of making a demand, and then, without more, may re-enter. Of course that is not the meaning of the court, which is that there must be another default following the demand; but there is not a word in the lease about a second default, and it is impossible by any ingenuity of construction to refer the default in payment within twenty-one days which is mentioned, to this second default on de-

mand which is not. We should have thought that a more natural construction would have been either to refer the words "being demanded" to the words immediately preceding, viz., "shall become due," so as to make necessary a demand on the day when the rent became due (which in that case must by the context mean become due under the reservation and before the commencement of the twenty-one days); or better still, to take the words absolutely, and so bring them under the third condition of a strict demand mentioned in Notes to Wms. Saund. p. 434, by which the demand must be made "on the day when the rent is due and payable by the lease to save the forfeiture," that is, on the twenty-first day. In either case the plaintiff would have been equally out of court, for the demand was made a fortnight after the quarter day. But in fact the Court seem to have arrived at the curious construction which they adopted in order to avoid determining whether the demand required was in any sense to be regulated by the old common law rules. The result, if it is to be accepted as law, may be convenient, but the remedy is certainly violent. It would be far better that the burdensome formalities required by the common law, which were once a wise protection to tenants, but which are certainly no longer needed, should be repealed by Act of Parliament, and the Courts set at liberty to construe instruments according to their true intent and meaning.

RECENT DECISIONS.

COMMON LAW.

ESTOPPEL—STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

Board v. Board, Q.B., 22 W. R. 206, L. R. 9 Q. B. 48.

This case falls entirely within the principle of *Asher v. Whitelock* (14 W. R. 26, L. R. 1 Q. B. 1). Mere possession was there held to be a devisable interest in this sense, that one who comes into the possession of a devisee of the original possessor, cannot defend himself against the devisee in remainder of the same possessor, or, which is the same thing, against the heir of such devisee. That case was the more striking from the circumstance that the defendant, though he had come into possession through the devisee for life or widowhood (that is, by marrying the testator's widow), did not come into her title, which was extinguished by the very act of marriage. The further circumstance occurred there, that the devisee in remainder was an infant, so that the principle of *Thomas v. Thomas* (2 K. & J. 79, see *Quinton v. Frith*, Ir. L. R. 2 Eq. 396, 494) might, perhaps, have been applied to estop the defendant from treating his own possession as other than that of an agent for her, by which means a connected possession of twenty years would have been obtained as to part of the land, and an absolute estate in fee acquired by the devisee in remainder by virtue of the "legislative conveyance" (*Scott v. Nixon*, 2 Con. & L. 185, 194). But it is evident that the view taken by the Court was founded entirely on estoppel, and took no account of the Statute of Limitations, which would indeed have been applicable to part of the land only. The principle is, in fact, the same as that on which, in *Cuthbertson v. Irving* (6 H. & N. 135), it was held that, as against a tenant, a reversion by estoppel may be assigned, so as to carry with it covenants and the right to distrain.

The present case is in one respect less strong than *Asher v. Whitelock*, namely, that the possession here relied on by the defendant was had directly under the will. The devisee for life sold to the defendant the land which she had occupied as such devisee, and in an action of ejectment, brought after the death of the devisee for life by the devisee in remainder, he was held entitled to succeed. An attempt was made to set up the fact that the devisee for life had occupied for more than thirty years, but if once the principle of estoppel is admitted, it can make no difference that the time of occu-

pation is such as, apart from that circumstance, would have conferred a title under the Statute of Limitations; the quality of the possession does not change with the mere lapse of time, except where the express provisions of the statute (as in the case of a tenancy at will) give that effect to time. This case, then, like *Asher v. Whitelock*, depended entirely on estoppel; if there is anything beyond this in it, it is that the Statute of Limitations will not help a possessor who is estopped from setting up his possession.

These two cases must be broadly distinguished from such a case as *Doe d. Curtis v. Barnard* (13 Q. B. 945), where a question of successive possession also arose, but without touching the rule of estoppel. There the plaintiff had not properly succeeded to the possession of her husband (who was not the true owner), but had merely succeeded him in possession; the defendant, who had afterwards gained possession, was mortgagee for a term from the true owner. If the plaintiff had merely shown her own possession since her husband's death, she would have been entitled to recover, on the presumption of ownership in fee raised by possession, the defendant being unable to rely on his true title by reason of his having been twenty years out of possession; but, inasmuch as her husband's antecedent possession was shown, the presumption of a fee in him took priority of and excluded the possessory presumption of a fee in her. The case, therefore, really amounted to this—the plaintiff could not succeed, from inability to show title, whether depending on her own prior possession (because the still earlier possession of her husband destroyed the presumption) or depending on her own possession joined with her husband's (because, not claiming under him nor having come in under him, she could not join on his possession to hers, so as to acquire title from a complete twenty years' period of possession). If, instead of the plaintiff being the widow of the intestate original possessor, his heir or devisee had continued the possession so as to make up a twenty years' possession out of the two successive possessions, and had then been put to sue in ejectment, he would have succeeded.

The result is, that if a second possessor comes in with a fresh possession, he can, so long as he is in, resist the attack of the true owner suing after the expiration of twenty years from the accruing of his right (in the statutory sense); but if he is out he cannot recover possession, unless he has himself had a twenty years' possession. If, on the contrary, the second possessor comes in so as to continue the possession of the first, he can add the successive possessions together, so as to make the statute not only a shield of defence, but (under section 34) a sword of attack; but then he must fulfil the conditions of his entry and enjoyment, by holding the property on the terms on which he originally obtained it and acquiring the title for all who are benefited by the same instrument.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS—SUBPENA DUCES TECUM.

Crowther v. Appleby, C.P., 22 W. R. 265, L. R. 9 C. P. 23.

The rule is well established that an order cannot be made on a defendant to produce documents which are not in his sole custody, as partnership books, when the other person entrusted refuses to allow of their production, and this rule was lately acted upon in *Hadley v. McDougal* (20 W. R. 393, L. R. 7 Ch. 312). The case is still stronger where they are in the possession of the person called on to produce them only as servant to the real owner, as in *Earl of Falmouth v. Moss* (11 Price, 455). That rule was acted upon in *Crowther v. Appleby* (*ubi sup.*), where it was held that the secretary of a company, which was not a party to the action, could not be compelled under a subpoena to produce the books of the company, the company refusing to allow him to do so. We observe, however, that reliance is placed in the judgment on the case of *Lee v. Angus* (14 W. R. 667, L. R. 2 Eq. 59), in

which Wood, V.C., is said to have followed *Attorney-General v. Wilson* (9 Sim. 526) on this point. This is an entire misapprehension. In *Lee v. Angus* the Vice-Chancellor said distinctly that in *Attorney-General v. Wilson* two points were raised, one that the books were partnership books, another which turned on the sufficiency in form of the *subpœna*, and it was on the latter point exclusively, not on the former, which was not raised by *Lee v. Angus*, that the Vice-Chancellor followed the earlier decision.

NOTES.

On Monday, the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, in *Ex parte Southam*, decided a question upon the construction of the Bills of Sale Act, 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. 36). By section 2 of that Act it is provided that if a bill of sale is made "subject to any defeasance or condition or declaration of trust not contained in the body thereof," the defeasance, condition, or declaration of trust is, for the purposes of the Act, to be taken as part of the bill of sale, and is to be written on the same paper before registration, otherwise the bill of sale is to be null and void as if it had not been registered. In *Ex parte Southam* the bankrupt had given a bill of sale to secure £250 and interest payable on demand, and the bill was registered within the twenty-one days. But, before the execution of the bill of sale, there was a parol agreement between the parties, of which no notice appeared on the register, that the debt should be paid off by small weekly instalments, and that if these were duly made the security should not be enforced. The Chief Judge, affirming the decision of Mr. J. A. Russell, Q.C., the judge of the Manchester County Court, held that the bill of sale was rendered void by section 2, by reason of the non-registration of the agreement as to payment by instalments.

On the same day the Chief Judge, in *Ex parte Jacobs*, decided that proof of a debt, for which bills of exchange are held as security, cannot be admitted at the first meeting of creditors without production of the bills. Neither the Act of 1869 nor the Rules of 1870 say expressly that this production is necessary; indeed, the language of rules 67 and 72, and of form 32, might well lead to a contrary conclusion. The decision, therefore, is one of which practitioners will do well to take note.

A correspondent says:—"Looking back over that part of the Statute Book which took its origin during the late Parliament, it will be found that a vast amount of noiseless but useful work has been done in the way of consolidation. The law of Bankruptcy by 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71. and Cattle Diseases in 1869, by 32 & 33 Vict. c. 70. The law of Naturalization by 33 Vict. c. 14. Stamps by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 97, and National Debt by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 71, in 1870. The law of Hawkers and Pedlars by 34 & 35 Vict. c. 96. The law of Mines by 35 & 36 Vict. c. 76, and Pawnbrokers by 35 & 36 Vict. c. 93, in 1872. The Slave Trade Acts, by 36 & 37 Vict. c. 88, in 1873. Such is a brief summary of what has been done during that period, while, in addition to the passing of four general Statute Law Revision Acts within the five years, 107 enactments, mostly whole Acts, were repealed by the Inland Revenue Repeal Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 99), and 36 Acts were wholly, and 40 Acts partly, repealed by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 48). The passing of Consolidation Acts," our correspondent adds, "not unpractised by a Liberal Government, is just the work for a Conservative one. That year of hurry-scurry debate and helter-skelter legislation, 1872, produced statutes upon the subjects of Adulteration, Licensing, and Public Health, which notoriously confused besides amending the law. Only two statutes, that of 1872 and one of 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 84), contain the statute law of adulteration, and the common law of the subject is simple enough (see Chitty's Criminal Law, vol. 2, citing 2 East P. C. 821), so that it would not be very difficult to frame a code of Adulteration Law. Considering that Sir H. S. Ibbetson is now in office, that he was the author of the Wine and Beerhouse Act, 1869 (which made the legislation of 1872 possible), and that he was himself pre-

pared with a consolidation bill in that year, it seems not unlikely that Licensing Consolidation may be attempted. Sir C. Adderley, too, who is also in office, has in a previous session introduced a Public Health Consolidation Bill, containing, if my memory serves me right, no less than 500 clauses."

The *Albany Law Journal* notices a decision of the United States Supreme Court (*Washington, Alexandria, and Georgetown Railroad Company v. Brown*), tending towards the removal of the distinctions which exist across the Atlantic between white and coloured people in respect of public privileges. A United States grant to a railroad company contained a provision that "no person shall be excluded from the cars on account of colour." A coloured woman having entered a car appropriated to women, was requested to take a seat in a car appropriated to coloured persons, and, on refusing to do so, she was ejected. The Supreme Court has decided that the provision in the grant did not simply require the railroad company to furnish passage to coloured persons, but that the company was bound to allow coloured persons in cars where white persons are admitted, and that the coloured woman was wrongfully ejected in this case. The Court was of opinion that the National Legislature, when it provided that "no person shall be excluded from the car on account of colour," intended to provide against discrimination between white and coloured people.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LESSONS OF THE TRIAL.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The great bubble has burst at last, and the "liar, perjurer, forger, and felon," as the present Chief Justice of the Common Pleas termed him, in a well-known climax, has been convicted and sentenced. The two trials have brought to light many weak places in our civil and criminal procedure, and it is to be presumed that we shall now set about some practical reforms. What Tichborne Act or Acts then may we be likely to see introduced? The following are perhaps the leading questions which the two great trials may bring on for discussion:—(1) The shortening of the period of limitation in the case of owners of real property absent by their own choice. (2) The payment of jurors. (3) The pressing of witnesses with questions alleged to go to their credit. (4) Contempt of court. (5) The shortening of the speeches of counsel; and (6) the calling of material witnesses, called by neither party, by the Court itself.

A LAWYER.

COURTS.

BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Registrar ROCHER, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Feb. 10.—*Re Viscount de Palma*.

P., a non-trader, having been adjudicated a bankrupt under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, incurred fresh debts, which resulted in a second adjudication being pronounced before the first bankruptcy had been closed.

The receiver under the second adjudication discovered that the bankrupt was possessed of furniture, and the trustees appointed by the creditors claimed it as against the trustee under the first adjudication.

Held, however, that by virtue of the 15th section, sub-section 3, the trustee under the first bankruptcy was entitled to the furniture, subject to the claim of a bill of sale holder, and subject also to the payment of the costs of the receiver under the second adjudication.

This case was brought before the Court upon an application to determine the rights of trustees under two distinct bankruptcies. The facts are stated in the judgment.

Freshfield (solicitor), for the trustee under the first bankruptcy.

Lumley (solicitor), for the trustee under the second bankruptcy.

His Honour delivered the following judgment:—The question in this case is one of considerable importance, although the amount involved is inconsiderable. Upon the

30th of September, 1870, Joachim Almeida de Portugal, of 44, Finsbury Circus, in the City of London, merchant, was adjudicated a bankrupt. Under that bankruptcy Mr. Broad was appointed trustee. Under that bankruptcy no assets have been collected; the bankrupt remains undischarged, and the bankruptcy has not been closed. On the 20th September, 1873, Joachim Viscount de Palma, of New Broad-street, in the City of London, agent to the Government of Auranca and Patagonia, was adjudicated a bankrupt. Under that bankruptcy Mr. Singleton was appointed trustee. In the interval between the filing of the petition and the adjudication Mr. Saffery was appointed receiver by the Court.

That gentleman, having obtained information that the bankrupt had some property, seized that property, which since, by agreement, has been sold, and the proceeds are now in safe custody, awaiting the decision of some question which probably may come before the Court as to the validity of a bill of sale given by Viscount de Palma, the bankrupt under the second bankruptcy, to Messrs. Dyson, who supplied the furniture comprised in the bill of sale during the pendency of the first bankruptcy, which has not yet been closed. At the first meeting under the second bankruptcy it appeared that Joachim Almeida de Portugal was the same person as Joachim Viscount de Palma, and the question which the Court has now to determine arises under the 15th section, sub-section 3, of the Act of 1869. It is this, whether the property seized under the second bankruptcy is vested by statute in the trustee under the first bankruptcy, or whether, in the events that have happened, the trustee under the second bankruptcy has not an equitable right to the furniture. The law on the point was very clearly and very distinctly stated long before the Act of 1869, in a case which occurred in 1864, namely, the case of *Morgan v. Knight*, 12 W. R. 428, in which Chief Justice Erle reviewed the whole of the law relating to subsequently acquired property, and the effect of more than one or two petitions pending at the same time. The old law was quite clear. A second commission or a second fiat was absolutely void. But ultimately the Court adopted a more reasonable view, and they determined that where the trustee under the first bankruptcy had been guilty of negligence, and had permitted the bankrupt to carry on trade and contract debts, and had stood by and allowed property to remain in the order and disposition of the bankrupt as reputed owner at the time of the second bankruptcy, the Court would not interfere. The case which I have mentioned was an action of trover, and it was pleaded that the property belonged to the first assignee. The Court would not interfere to deprive the assignee under the second bankruptcy of the property. In this case the circumstances are peculiar, because all the parties have been acting an innocent comedy of errors. Mr. Broad, the trustee under the first bankruptcy, when he saw advertised in the *Gazette* Joachim Viscount de Palma, of New Broad-street, Agent of the Auranca and Patagonian Government, could not, unless he had the gift of foresight, have suspected that he was the same person as Almeida de Portugal, of whose estate he had been appointed trustee three years before. On the same principle Mr. Singleton, the trustee under the second bankruptcy, seeing the name and address entirely different under the first bankruptcy, could have had no reason to suspect that there was a previous bankruptcy pending against a person to whose estate under the second bankruptcy he had been appointed trustee. It would be manifestly unjust to make any charge of *laches* against the trustee under the first bankruptcy. If I were to allocate any credit at all it would be to the receiver appointed under the second petition, who managed, happily, to collect the single asset which now is divisible among the creditors. The furniture supplied was supposed to be valued at £100 at first, and then it was estimated at £50, but it was actually sold for £42. That money is now in hand, but the words of the statute, out of which it would be improper for me to travel, are quite clear and distinct upon the subject. The 15th section, paragraph 3, defines the nature of the property which is to devolve on the trustee at the commencement of the bankruptcy, and which remains vested in him during its continuance. The latter paragraph of the section says:

"Or any such property as shall be acquired or devolve upon

the bankrupt during its continuance," that is, the continuance of the bankruptcy. Those words appear to have been put in carefully by the gentleman who drew the Act for the purpose of excluding this class of questions, between first and second or subsequent bankruptcies, and creditors, that have arisen under different estates. But if I turn to the 54th section I see that a period is fixed by statute at which the rights of subsequent creditors are to arise; for in the second sub-section of that section it is provided that after the expiration of a period of three years from the close of the bankruptcy, if any balance of the debts remain unpaid that balance is to be considered a subsisting debt in the nature of a judgment debt, and subject to the rights of any persons who have become creditors of the bankrupt since the close of the bankruptcy, it may be enforced by the Court having jurisdiction in the matter of the bankruptcy. I think those two sections, taken together, clearly show that the statutory title is given to the trustee under the first bankruptcy until its close; but in saying so I am guided also by the observation made by Lord Justice James in the case of *Es parte Robertson, re Magnus*, 21 W. R. 875, L. R. 8 Ch. 962, in which a question arose as to the right to prove in respect of a debt which had been incurred by the debtor since the petition for liquidation. In that case Lord Justice James said that this court, being a court of equity as well as a court of common law, would adjust equities, and if the application in that case had been made in a proper form Lord Justice James said he had no doubt that the rights of the subsequent creditors might have been adjusted.

Under the whole of the circumstances of the case, I cannot see how I can travel out of the express terms of the Act of Parliament: therefore I declare that this furniture vests in the trustee under the first bankruptcy, but he takes it subject to all the equities. That would have been the course taken under the old law, and I cannot impute any blame under the circumstances that have occurred to the trustee under the first bankruptcy. The furniture will vest in the trustee under the first bankruptcy, and I shall direct the costs to be taxed of Mr. Saffery, the receiver, the officer of the court through whose diligence this sole asset has been collected for the estate, and I shall direct the balance to be paid, if any, to the trustee under the first bankruptcy. This will be subject to any claim which the bill of sale holders may have. I think that should be inserted in the order.

(Before Mr. Registrar MURRAY, sitting as Chief Judge.)

Feb. 18.—*Re McArthur*.

New first meeting of creditors allowed where debt inadvertently omitted.

This was an application on behalf of a debtor who had filed a petition for liquidation by arrangement or composition for leave to call a first meeting of creditors in substitution for a meeting already held.

It appeared that at the first meeting of creditors the creditors present or represented passed a resolution for the acceptance of a composition in satisfaction of their debts, and the meeting was adjourned. Between the first and the adjourned meeting it was discovered that the debtor had become surety to a loan society for payment by the principal debtor of a sum of about £100, and the list of creditors contained no mention of the liability. Immediately upon the fact being ascertained, notice was given to the liability creditor of the adjourned meeting, but he did not attend, and the creditors then passed a resolution in favour of liquidation by arrangement. Upon the papers being brought before the Registrar, he declined to register them, on the ground that all the creditors had not received notice of the first meeting. The vote of the omitted creditor would have affected the majority.

Brough, in support of the application.—The affidavit shows that the omission to include the liability arose from inadvertence, and in such a case the Court will allow a new first meeting to be held: *Es parte Cohen, Re Cohen*, 18 S. J. 293.

Mr. Registrar MURRAY.—In this case I think a new meeting may be allowed without detriment to the interests of the creditors, subject to the production of an affidavit showing the precise circumstances under which the omission occurred.

Solicitor, Rawlings.

COMMON PLEAS, IRELAND.

(Before DOWSE, B.)

Feb. 28.—*In Re Mayo County Election Petition and In Re Athlone Election Petition.**

Jurisdiction of judge on the rota—Statement of special case for the Court of Common Pleas.

In an election petition, on an application to state a special case for the Court of Common Pleas, pursuant to 31 & 32 Vict. c. 125 s. 11, cl. 16, it was held that this jurisdiction did not belong to a judge on the rota, not a member of that Court.

This was an application pursuant to the provisions of 31 & 32 Vict. c. 125, s. 11, cl. 16, which provides "Where upon the application of any party to a petition made in the prescribed manner to the Court, it appears to the Court that the case raised by the petition can be conveniently stated as a special case, the Court may direct the same to be stated accordingly, and any such special case shall, as far as may be, be heard before the Court, and the decision of the Court shall be final, and the Court shall certify to the speaker its decision in reference to such special case." The same point arising in both petitions, by the request of the Court both cases were argued together by the respective counsel.

Armstrong, Serjeant, for the petitioners in the Mayo case.

Armstrong, Serjeant (David Fitzgerald with him), for the petitioner in the Athlone case.—By 44th G. O. it is provided that all interlocutory matters except as to the sufficiency of the security shall be heard by and disposed of before a judge, who shall have the same control over the proceedings under the Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, as a judge in chambers in the ordinary proceedings of the superior courts, and such questions and matters shall be heard by and disposed of by one of the judges upon the rota, if practicable, and if not then by any judge at chambers." By 37th G. O. it is provided, "that the application to state a special case may be made by rule in the Court of Common Pleas when sitting, or by a summons before a judge at chambers, upon hearing the parties." Reading the 37th and 44th G. O. together, the intention appears to have been to meet the very exigency that has arisen. The 37th G. O. may be said to mean such a judge as is pointed out by the 44th rule—that is, a judge on the rota. The order does not say that the application shall be made to "the Court of Common Pleas when sitting, or to any judge thereof." It is a narrow construction to put upon the order. If all the judges of the Court of Common Pleas were out of town, it would be a hard case if all the business of the country should be delayed on that account.

Sheridan, for respondents in the Mayo case.

Pureell, Q.C. (*Costello* with him), for respondents in the Athlone case.—This application can only be made to the full Court of Common Pleas or to a member of that court. The Act confers the power upon the "Court." By section 2 this word is defined to mean the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster or Dublin respectively. It is, therefore, plain that unless there is some alteration caused by the rules, which the judges are authorised to make by section 25, there is no jurisdiction. Rule 37 only says such application shall be made to the Court of Common Pleas, when sitting, or a judge in chambers: how can it be contended that it does not mean a judge of the same court?

Dowse, B.—The way the matter stands is this. This application is made to me under sub-section 16 of the 11th section of the Parliamentary Election Act, 1868. The 11th section deals with the trial of petitions, and it provides that if, upon the application of any party, it appears to the Court that the case raised can be conveniently stated as a special case, the Court may direct it to be stated, and any such special case may be heard by the Court, and the decision of the Court shall be final, and the Court is to certify its determination to the Speaker of the House of Commons. The judges upon the rota are to hear and try the petition, but the present motion is to take the case out of the order of hearing before a judge in the country, and make it as it were a question for demurrer, and not a cause at Nisi Prius; and there is every reason why that application should be made in strictness to the full Court of Common Pleas. On referring to the section which gives jurisdiction it is defined to be the Court of Common Pleas in Dublin. Under the Common Law Procedure Act this

word "Court" generally means the Full Court, though there are cases where it has been held to be applicable to a judge. The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, gives the judges full power to make orders. These rules are copied *totidem verbis* from the English rules, the judges wisely doing so for the sake of uniformity. Considering that election petitions arise suddenly, and knowing that the Court of Common Pleas only sits *in banco* for about twelve weeks in the year, the rule provides that an application may be made before a judge in chambers, but I am of opinion that that still means a judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Interlocutory motions, on the other hand, are different, they may be dealt with before a judge on the rota "if practicable and if not, before any other judge at chambers." Another difficulty I have is that, supposing I considered I had jurisdiction, has the party against whom I decide the opportunity of controlling my decision? There is no appeal given; so that if I made an order on the present application to state a case, and when it came before the Court it was suggested that I had no jurisdiction to make the order, and the Court agreed with that objection, then this difficulty which I suggest would arise. Entertaining, as I do, not a positive opinion, but a grave doubt as to my jurisdiction, I am not ambitious to undertake duties not imposed upon me by the statute, whilst at the same time I am willing to do whatever is imposed on me. I will make no rule on these applications, but will make no order as to costs.

Attorney for the petitioner in Mayo case, *Dillon*.

Attorneys for the respondents in Mayo case, *Griffin & Plunkett*.

Attorney for respondents in Athlone case, *Costello*.

COUNTY COURTS.

LIVERPOOL.

(Before J. F. COLLIER, Esq., Judge.)

Feb. 27.—*In re Thomas Lund*.

A debtor having filed a petition for liquidation or composition, a resolution accepting a composition payable by instalments, extending over twelve months, was duly passed by his creditors on the 17th of September, 1872, and was subsequently confirmed and registered. The debtor failed to pay the first instalment and was adjudicated a bankrupt on the 9th December, 1872.

Held, that the proceedings for composition were "pending," so as to enable the costs, incurred in relation to them, to be paid by the trustee under rule 292.

The motion in this case was that the Court should order the trustee in bankruptcy of the estate of Thomas Lund to pay to Mr. John Leigh, an attorney, the amount of his taxed costs in the matter of a petition for liquidation or composition, filed by the said Thomas Lund in the County Court of Lancashire, holden at Blackburn.

Walton, for the trustee.

James, for Mr. Leigh.

His Honour said.—The facts are these:—On the 22nd August, 1872, Thomas Lund filed a petition for liquidation or composition in the Blackburn County Court. The first meeting of creditors was held on the 17th September, at which a resolution was duly passed to accept a composition of 10s. in the pound in instalments extending over a period of twelve months. That resolution was confirmed at a second meeting, and the two together formed the extraordinary resolution required by the Act. The resolutions were duly registered. The debtor proved unable to pay the first instalment. Another meeting of creditors was called on the 1st November, under the 126th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, to vary the previous resolution, but no resolution was passed. Mr. Leigh was the attorney employed in and about the affairs of the debtor up to the registration, and to him the registration of the resolutions was entrusted by the creditors. On the 28th November a petition was filed by a creditor who had not assented to the composition, that the debtor should be adjudicated a bankrupt, the act of bankruptcy alleged being the filing of the original petition for liquidation or composition. The debtor was adjudicated a bankrupt on this act of bankruptcy on the 9th December, and on the 30th the proceedings in the bankruptcy were removed into the Liverpool court. Under these circumstances Mr. Leigh claims his costs, as taxed by the registrar of the Blackburn court, from the trustee in bankruptcy. The 292nd rule provides that where

* Reported by OSCAR R. ROCHES Esq. Barrister-at-law.

bankruptcy occurs pending proceedings for or towards liquidation or composition, the proper costs incurred in relation to such proceedings shall be paid by the trustee unless the Court shall otherwise order. The question is, were proceedings for a composition pending at the time of the bankruptcy? Fortunately, I am not entirely without guidance as to the construction in which ought to be put upon this rule. In the case of *Ex parte Howell, Re Hawes*, 22 W. R. 287, Mellish, L.J., is reported to have said that the object of the provision made by the rule was, he thought, plain enough. If there were no such provision, no solicitor would ever act on behalf of a debtor who desired him to present a petition for liquidation, or would recommend a debtor to adopt such proceeding, without getting his costs beforehand, and that might prevent many persons from presenting petitions at all. The object of the rule was that solicitors, if they acted fairly, might be able to get their costs although the proceedings for liquidation proved abortive and bankruptcy ensued. That being the object of the rule, such a construction should, if possible, be put upon it as would fairly carry out that object. In his Lordship's opinion it was not necessary to put such a strict construction on the words as to hold that whenever anything occurred which rendered liquidation impossible under the petition the proceedings were no longer pending. In that case a petition for liquidation had been filed; at the first meeting the creditors negatived the resolution for liquidation, and on the following day the debtor was adjudicated a bankrupt. The Chief Judge, whose decision was upheld on appeal, held that the proceedings were pending within the 292nd rule, and that the solicitor in the liquidation was entitled to his costs out of the bankrupt's estate. I quote that case only because I believe all previous cases bearing on the subject were mentioned in the argument, and it is the latest case in which the subject has been considered. Mellish, L.J., based his decision principally upon the fact that as the receiver had not been discharged the property remained under the protection of the Court, and the proceedings for liquidation were thus still pending. I am afraid I have hardly such substantial ground to go on; but the composition was payable by instalments extending over twelve months. By the 126th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, it is provided that the provisions of any composition may be enforced by the Court on a motion made in a summary manner by any person interested. This being so, can it be said that the proceedings are absolutely dead until the composition has been paid? But if they are not dead they are pending. The Court still has cognizance of the matter. Again, if a composition is not paid, the original debts may be recovered in full by action at law, or, in the alternative, the better opinion seems to be—though this I believe, has not been actually decided—a creditor may ask for an adjudication on the act of bankruptcy committed by filing the petition; but if this be so, if the creditors may revert to the petition, if anything is in action by means of which the creditors may resort to further proceedings, can the proceedings in the composition be said to have come to an end? I think, although I acknowledge the matter is not free from doubt, that, upon the construction which ought to be put on the 292nd rule, they must be held to be sufficiently alive to enable the solicitor in the composition to have his costs paid. For these reasons I think that Mr. Leigh is entitled to have these costs out of the estate. On the question by whom they should be taxed, I have come to the conclusion that the taxation ought to be conducted in the Liverpool court. The trustee in bankruptcy has to pay them out of the bankrupt's estate; he is responsible to the creditors in bankruptcy; the proceeding is in bankruptcy, not in composition; the bankruptcy is in the Liverpool court; and I think the taxation should be in the court in which the bankruptcy is pending. The costs will come out of the estate.

Solicitors for the trustee, *Duncan, Hill, & Dickinson*.
Solicitors for Mr. Leigh, *Bellringer*.

CHANCERY.

(Before JAMES and MELLISH, L.JJ.)

March 4.—*In re Knockers, Solicitors*.

This was an appeal from a decision of Vice-Chancellor Malins.

The petition was presented by Mr. J. G. Churchward, formerly contractor for the carriage of the mails between Dover and Calais, and it sought the delivery to him and taxation of a bill of costs charged against him by Messrs. E.

and W. Knockers, solicitors, of Dover. The case made by the petition was this:—In the years 1860, 1861, and 1862 negotiations were entered into between Mr. Churchward and the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, with regard to a proposed sale and transfer to the company of Mr. Churchward's contracts for the carriage of the mails. In the conduct of these negotiations Mr. Edward Knockers acted on behalf of Mr. Churchward, at first alone, and afterwards jointly with the firm of Messrs. Wilkinson, Stevens, & Wilkinson, solicitors, of Nicholas-lane. In the summer of 1862 the negotiations were brought to a conclusion, one of the terms agreed upon being that the railway company should pay the costs incurred by Mr. Churchward in the negotiations. Messrs. Wilkinson & Co. and Messrs. Knockers accordingly sent in their bills of costs to the railway company. The bill sent in by Messrs. Knockers was only in rough draught, and it contained charges for costs amounting to £352 10s. The two bills of costs together amounted to £900. The railway company objected to this sum, and offered to pay £700 in full. This was assented to, and the £700 was paid by the company to Churchward. He afterwards paid it to Mr. Edward Knockers, for the purpose, as he said, of paying out of it the costs of Messrs. Knockers and the costs of Messrs. Wilkinson & Co. The petition alleged that Messrs. Knockers improperly retained the whole of the £700 on the allegation that moneys were due to them from Messrs. Wilkinson & Co. in respect of agency commission upon matters with which Mr. Churchward had nothing to do. The petition alleged that, in consequence of this retention, Mr. Churchward was compelled, in March, 1871, to pay Messrs. Wilkinson & Co. their bill of costs relating to the negotiations with the railway company; and the petition prayed delivery and taxation of Messrs. Knockers' bill of costs, and that they might be ordered to repay so much of the £700 as should exceed the amount found to be due to them. The Vice-Chancellor dismissed the petition with costs, and Mr. Churchward appealed. Messrs. Wilkinson & Co. denied that any sum was due from them to Messrs. Knockers for agency commission, or that they had acted as agents for them.

Glaspe, Q.C., and *J. Wilkinson* were heard in support of the appeal.

Cotton, Q.C., and *Graham Hastings*, for Messrs. Knockers, were not called upon to argue.

JAMES, L.J., said that it seemed to him a perfectly idle case, and the Vice-Chancellor took the same view of it. Mr. Churchward employed two firms of solicitors in this matter between himself and the railway company. Then, twelve years afterwards there was a dispute whether the London solicitors acted as the agents of the Dover solicitors, or whether the two firms were jointly interested in the matter. However that might have been, it was clear that the arrangement made was that the railway company were to be the real paymasters; they were to pay whatever was due. Each of the solicitors sent in his account to the railway company; the two bills amounted to £900. The company said, "We will pay £700 in full satisfaction of both." That was agreed to, and each of the two firms signed a receipt for the bill, and left the bill with the receipt in the hands of the real paymasters. So far as regarded payment of the bills of costs by the company, the whole thing was then settled. It was like the case of a mortgagor paying his mortgagee's bill of costs, or a lessee that of his lessor. The £700 was paid to Churchward, and he paid it to Knockers. Then a dispute arose between Messrs. Knockers and Messrs. Wilkinson with regard to the latter's share of the £700. Whatever way you were to take it—whether Wilkinson & Co. were agents, or whether they were jointly interested—there was a payment of the sum agreed to be paid by the company for the costs, and the matter was then completely settled as between them and the two sets of solicitors. If by any miscarriage Wilkinson & Co. had got their costs paid a second time by Churchward, that could not give him a right to recover the money from Messrs. Knockers.

MELLISH, L.J., was of the same opinion. What clearly showed that it was intended there should be only one bill of costs was the way in which the sum of £700 was arrived at. Both sets of solicitors agreed that this sum should be sufficient as regarded the railway company, and, as the company were to pay all Churchward's costs, both firms must be taken to have agreed that the £700 should discharge Churchward's liability also. Wilkinson & Co.

agreed that the payment should be made to Messrs. Knocker, but, unfortunately, there afterwards arose a disagreement between them. The appeal must be dismissed with costs.—*Times*.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. HENRY JOHN LOWNDES GRAHAM has been appointed Principal Secretary to the Lord Chancellor. Mr. Graham was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1868.

Mr. FRANCIS A. BEDWELL, barrister-at-law, has been appointed judge of the County Court Circuit No. 16 (East Yorkshire), vacant by the resignation of Mr. Chapman Barber. Mr. Bedwell was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in Easter Term, 1855, and has practised at the equity bar.

Mr. G. H. BARNE, barrister-at-law, has been nominated to the Attorney-Generalship of Jamaica, vacant by the death of Mr. E. A. C. Schalch. Mr. Barne was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in Michaelmas Term, 1866.

Mr. P. H. EDLIN, Q.C., who has been appointed Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions in succession to Sir William Bodkin, was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1847, and was made a Queen's Counsel in 1869, and a bencher of his Inn in the following year. He is a member of the Western Circuit, and holds the office of Recorder of Bridgwater.

Mr. R. JEHU, of Mark-lane, has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery, and a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgment of deeds by married women.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER, D.C.L., barrister-at-law, the new member for the county of Wexford, is the son of the late Sir George Bowyer, by his wife Anne Hammond, daughter of the late Sir Andrew Snape Douglas, R.N. He was born in 1811, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Trinity Term, 1839. He is a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Berkshire. He represented Dundalk from 1852 to the General Election of November, 1868. In 1850 he was appointed Reader at the Middle Temple.

Mr. FREDERICK LOWTEN SPINKS, serjeant-at-law, the new member for Oldham, is the son of Mr. John Spinks, solicitor, by Mary, daughter of Mr. Peter La Coste, of Byfleet, Surrey. He was born in 1816, and was educated at King's College School, London, and at Magdalen College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1843, and was made a serjeant-at-law in 1862. He is a magistrate for the county of Kent.

The Hon. EDWARD STANHOPE, barrister-at-law, the new member for Mid-Lincolnshire, is the second son of Philip Henry, fifth Earl Stanhope, by Emily Harriet, second daughter of the late Sir Edward Kerrison, of Oakley-park, Suffolk. He was born in 1840, and was educated at Harrow and at Christ Church, Oxford. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1865, and is a member of the Home Circuit.

Mr. SAMUEL DANKS WADDY, Q.C., the new member for Barnstaple, is the son of the Rev. S. D. Waddy, D.D., by Elizabeth, daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Danks, of Wednesbury, Staffordshire. He was born in 1830, and was educated at the Wesleyan College, at Sheffield, and at the University of London. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1858, and is a member of the Midland Circuit. He was made a Queen's Counsel last month.

The *Liverpool Post* says that as it is unlikely that Lord Derby, chairman of the Kirkdale Quarter Sessions, and Mr. R. A. Cross, M.P., vice-chairman, now that they are ministers, will continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices in administering justice at the Quarter Sessions, the suggestion has been revived that an assistant judge should be appointed for the West Derby Hundred, as in the case of the other division of the county—the Salford Hundred—where Mr. Higgins is assistant judge, and receives a salary of £300 a year.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LEGAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

The following donations have been received since the meeting of the Executive Committee on the 19th December, 1873:—

	£	s.	d.
The Right Honble. Lord Selborne	5	0	0
The Right Honble. M. Bernard	5	0	0
The Right Honble. Sir E. Ryan	5	5	0
The Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall	5	5	0
The Honble. Baron Amphlett	5	5	0
The Incorporated Law Society	50	0	0
Aldridge, W. W., Esq.	1	1	0
Anstie, A., Esq.	1	1	0
Barrett, R. H., Esq. (Slough)	1	1	0
Baxter, R., Esq.	5	0	0
Beck, S. Adams, Esq.	3	3	0
Beck, R. C. Adams, Esq.	2	2	0
Beever, J. F., Esq.	1	1	0
Bedwell, F. A., Esq.	3	3	0
Blandy, W. F., Esq. (Reading)	2	2	0
Bolton Law Society	3	3	0
Boys, C. O., Esq.	1	1	0
Bowen, C. S. C., Esq.	3	3	0
Broomhead, B. P., Esq. (Sheffield)	3	3	0
Buchanan, J., Esq., & Son (Whitby) ..	1	1	0
Burton, E. F., Esq.	3	3	0
Cator, B. P., Esq.	1	1	0
Clabon, J. M., Esq.	5	0	0
Clements, G. M., Esq.	1	1	0
Cobb, T. P., Esq.	2	2	0
Cookson, Montague, Esq.	3	3	0
Cowburn, G., Esq.	2	2	0
Curling, R., Esq.	5	0	0
Davey, Horace, Esq.	3	3	0
Daniel, W. T. S., Esq., Q.C.	5	0	0
Dees, R. R., Esq. (Newcastle-on-Tyne) ..	5	0	0
DuCan, R., Esq.	1	1	0
Eddis, A. S., Esq., Q.C.	2	0	0
Farrer, W. J., Esq.	5	0	0
Finch, A. E., Esq.	3	3	0
FitzHugh, A. J., Esq. (Pighton)	2	2	0
Francis, H. J., Esq.	2	2	0
Freshfield, H. R., Esq.	5	0	0
Fry, Edw., Esq., Q.C.	5	5	0
Frere, Forster & Frere, Messrs.	5	0	0
Gedge, Kirby & Millett, Messrs.	3	3	0
Greene, T. W., Esq., Q.C.	5	5	0
Guest, W. H., Esq. (Manchester)	2	2	0
Harrison, C., Jun., Esq.	5	5	0
Herschell, F., Esq., Q.C.	5	0	0
Hodgson, C. H., Esq.	3	3	0
Hollams, J., Esq.	5	5	0
Horne, H. P., Esq.	1	1	0
Humfrys, W. J., Esq.	1	1	0
Jackson, H. M., Esq., Q.C., M.P.	5	5	0
Janson, F. H., Esq.	3	3	0
Jotcham, L., Esq. (Wantage)	1	1	0
Kay, Edward E., Esq., Q.C.	5	5	0
Keen, G., Esq.	2	2	0
Lake, Beaumont & Lake, Messrs.	5	5	0
Lindley, N., Esq., Q.C.	5	5	0
Longbourne, J. V., Esq.	3	3	0
Longbourne, C. R. V., Esq.	2	2	0
McClellan, John, Esq.	1	1	0
Macnamara, H., Esq.	2	2	0
Marten, A. G., Esq., Q.C., M.P.	5	5	0
Mathew, J. C., Esq.	3	0	0
Measure, J., Esq.	5	5	0
Metcalfe, W. C., Esq. (Epping)	1	1	0
Miller & Miller, Messrs.	3	3	0
Miller, Alexander E., Esq., Q.C.	2	2	0
Monckton, Herbert, Esq. (Maidstone) ...	1	1	0
Morgan, G. O., Esq., Q.C., M.P.	5	5	0
Morrell, F. J., Esq. (Oxford)	3	0	0
North, Ford, Esq.	3	3	0
Palmer, Ralph, Esq.	1	1	0
Peake, H., Esq.	1	1	0
Pearson, John, Esq., Q.C.	5	5	0
Pennington, R., Esq.	2	2	0

	£	s.	d.
Phillimore, W. G. F., Esq.	2	2	0
Price, C. U., Esq.	3	3	0
Radcliffe, J. A., Esq.	1	1	0
Redpath & Holdsworth, Messrs.	2	2	0
Roberts, Ph., Esq.	2	2	0
Rutter, W., Esq.	1	1	0
Stone, John, Esq. (Bath)	2	2	0
Thring, Sir Henry, K.C.B.	2	2	0
Tilleard, Godden & Holme, Messrs.	5	5	0
Trinder, H. W., Esq.	3	3	0
Walters, W. M., Esq.	1	1	0
Waterhouse, T., Esq.	1	1	0
Webster, T., Esq., Q.C.	2	2	0
Westlake, J., Esq., Q.C.	5	5	0
Wilde, C. N., Esq.	2	2	0
Wills, Alfred, Esq., Q.C.	2	0	0
Williams, W., Esq.	5	5	0
Williams, P., Esq.	2	2	0
Woods, Grosvenor, M. S., Esq.	1	1	0

Donations to be sent to the Treasurer, J. M. Clabon, Esq., 21, Great George-street, Westminster, S.W.

RALPH PALMER. WM. A. JEVONS.
ARTHUR J. WILLIAMS. JOHN V. LONGBOURNE.
Honorary Secretaries.

EXAMINATIONS AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

FINAL EXAMINATIONS, 1873.

Special Prizes.

Timpron Martin Prize for Candidates from Liverpool.

Mr. George Barrow Cummins having passed the best examination in the year 1873, and having attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Timpron Martin, of Liverpool.

Mr. Cummins served his clerkship with Messrs. Hoare & Monkhouse, of Liverpool, and Messrs. Milne, Riddle, & Mellor, of London, and obtained a prize in Michaelmas Term, 1873.

Atkinson Prize for Candidates from Liverpool or Preston.

Mr. George Hime having, from among the candidates from Liverpool or Preston, shown himself best acquainted with the law of real property and the practice of conveyancing, having otherwise passed a satisfactory examination, and having attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. John Atkinson, of Liverpool.

Mr. Hime served his clerkship with Messrs. Anderson, Collins, & Robinson, of Liverpool, and Messrs. T. & T. Martin, of Liverpool, and obtained a prize in Michaelmas Term, 1873.

Broderip Prize for Real Property and Conveyancing.—Open to all Candidates.

Mr. Henry Nicholas Grenside having, among the candidates in the year 1873, shown himself best acquainted with the law of real property and the practice of conveyancing, having passed a satisfactory examination, and having attained honorary distinction, the Council have awarded to him the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Francis Broderip, of Lincoln's-inn.

Mr. Grenside served his clerkship with Messrs. Walker & Langborne, of New Malton, and Mr. Leonard Hopwood Hicks, of London, and obtained a prize in Hilary Term, 1873.

Scott Scholarship.—Open to all Candidates.

Mr. Edwin Murcott being, in the opinion of the Council, the candidate best acquainted with the theory, principles, and practice of law, they have awarded to him the scholarship founded by Mr. John Scott, of Lincoln's-inn-fields, London.

Mr. Murcott served his clerkship with Mr. George Cattell Greenway, of Warwick, and Messrs. Robinson & Preston, of London, and obtained a prize in Michaelmas Term, 1873.

Birmingham Law Society's Prize for Candidates from Birmingham.

The examiners also reported that among the candidates from Birmingham in the year 1873, Mr. Richard Alfred Pinsent passed the best examination, and was, in the opinion of the examiners, entitled to honorary distinction.

Mr. Pinsent served his clerkship with Messrs. James & Oerton, of Birmingham, and Messrs. Church & Clarke, of London, and obtained a prize in Easter Term, 1873.

On report of the examiners, and

By order of the Council,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the usual monthly meeting of the directors, held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday the 5th inst., the following being present—viz., Mr. Steward (chairman), Mr. Carpenter, Mr. W. S. Masterman, Mr. Sidney Smith, Mr. H. Vallance, and Mr. Boodle (secretary)—a grant of £10 was made to a very aged solicitor who was in great distress, and the ordinary business was transacted.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn Hall, on Wednesday, the 4th March, Mr. T. B. Girling in the chair. Mr. Baker opened the subject for the evening's debate, viz.,—"That the 25th section of the Elementary Education Act should be repealed." The motion was lost by a majority of one.

OBITUARY.

WILLIAM SANDYS, ESQ., F.S.A.

Mr. William Sandys, of the junior branch of the family of Sandys long established in Cornwall, was born on the 29th of October, 1792, educated at Westminster School, admitted as a solicitor in Hilary Term, 1814, and continued to practise as such until he died on the morning of Ash Wednesday, the 18th of February, 1874, after an illness of some weeks' duration. He was the author of "An Essay on Freemasonry," a portion of which appeared as an article in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, "Select Specimens of Macaronic Poetry," "Christmas Carols, Ancient and Modern, with an Introduction and Notes," "Specimens of Cornish Provincial Dialect," and numerous other publications and contributions to different literary journals from time to time on subjects of antiquarian research, especially in relation to the county of Cornwall, very many of which cannot now be traced; but amongst them may be named a notice "On the Cornish Drama," "Transactions in Cornwall during the Civil War," and "Some Remarks on the Fairies and Giants of Cornwall," in the *Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall*. He had for many years given much of his spare time to the study of antiquities of Cornwall, to which county, as being that of his origin, he was to the last greatly attached. He was an accomplished violoncello player, having been taught by the celebrated Robert Lindley, who pronounced him to be the best amateur pupil he ever had. He possessed a singular faculty for mental arithmetic. Retiring and unobtrusive to a fault, within his private circle no man ever had more firmly attached friends. He married, firstly, in 1816, Harriet, eldest daughter of Peter Hill, late of Carwithenack, in the county of Cornwall, Esq., by whom he had several children, who all died in his lifetime except one daughter, Harriette, the wife of Edward Davies Brown, Esq., of 22, Grove End-road. His first wife having died in August, 1851, he married, secondly, in September, 1853, Eliza, daughter of Charles Pearson, Esq., late of Ravensbourne House, near Greenwich, by whom he left no issue. His remains were interred in his family grave in Kensal Green Cemetery.

MR. W. C. SCOTT.

Mr. William Carmalt Scott, judge of the County Court Circuit No. 49, died on the 3rd inst., at his residence in Eccleston-square, London. Mr. Scott was born on the 22nd December, 1824, and was therefore in his fiftieth year at the time of his death. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Hilary Term, 1843, and in February, 1858, was appointed principal secretary to the then Lord Chancellor (Lord Chelmsford), and occupied that post till June, 1859. He was gentleman of the chamber to Lord Chancellor Cranworth from July, 1865, till July, 1866, when

he again became principal secretary to Lord Chelmsford, continuing with his Lordship till the following September, when he was appointed judge of the Gloucestershire County Courts (Circuit No. 53), on the death of Mr. James Francillon. At the end of the same month he was transferred to the Kent Circuit (No. 49), succeeding the late Mr. Charles Harwood.

THREE REMARKABLE TRIALS.

AMERICAN LEGAL OPINION ON THE TRIAL OF THE CLAIMANT.
(From the *Albany Law Journal*.)

Three remarkable State trials have been recently going on in three different countries, illustrating different national traits in a peculiar degree. We refer to the trials of Marshal Bazaine in France, for treason, the Tichborne claimant in England, for perjury, and Tweed, in New York, for fraud. The first has illustrated the morbid love of glory in the French nation, their blind faith in their own invincibility, their ignorance of the march and significance of events, and their eagerness to seize on an individual scapegoat for every national defeat, which, to them, is synonymous with dishonour. The second illustrates the English grit and pluck in the person of the accused, the traditional respect for aristocratic institutions which is part of the theory of the government, the patience and persistence used in the investigation of private rights, and the love of fair play which is the inheritance and property of the common people. The third illustrates the comparative indifference of the better classes to the management of public affairs, and their long and patient submission to the most shameful and corrupt usurpations of power by individuals, in a country the theory of whose government is republican, and the final terrible re-action and utter overthrow of the usurpers, when once the popular back has felt the burden of the "last straw."

It must be admitted that the French do not bear reverses well. They do not shine in misfortune. Glory is their ailment, and success is essential to their equanimity. Some one has remarked that in all Napoleon's proclamations to his army there is not a word about duty, but glory is the theme; while in those of Wellington every thing is made of duty, and glory has no place. The French nation could never have borne the reverses under which the great Frederick staggered for so many years, nor those which so persistently pursued the northern States of our Union during the first years of our great civil war. If the French had been on the defensive on Mont St. Jean, instead of being the assailants, the battle of Waterloo would have been decided much earlier in the day, and without any help from Blücher. There is always a traitor in every great defeat of the French arms, treason in every overwhelming misfortune. It was Grouchy at Waterloo, it was Bazaine at Metz. In the particular instance under consideration we doubt not that in the national chase the hunted is nobler than the hounds, and that history will do justice to a soldier who was faithful, if not great. It is quite instructive to note in the same newspaper column that tells us of the cries of exultation with which the mob received the news of Bazaine's conviction, that when the steamship *Ville du Havre* went down, her crew saved themselves almost to a man, and left the helpless passengers, not one of whom was brought off by the steamer's boats, to sink in the vortex of the vessel, or be picked up by the boats of the neighbouring English ship.

The avidity with which France demands a victim for national calamity is inexplicable, and the satisfaction with which she accepts the sacrifice is disgusting to an Anglo-Saxon mind. As to the trial, the event being foregone, all the dramatic proprieties were observed. There was the customary "effusion" on all sides; the prisoner's advocate used himself up with the affecting nature of his rhetoric and the violence of his oratory before he completed his task; the victim received the news of the inevitable result with entire composure, and to him, as to Cambronne at Waterloo, was at once attributed a short but sublime speech which he never made, and which every body in France knew at the time that he never made; and after the victim had thus been revolved on, the immolation was waived, and so the national magnanimity was displayed as well as the national honour vindicated. In all this sublime farce appears one singular gleam of sense. The president of the tribunal, the Duc d'Aumale, who had sojourned much in England, and frequented her courts, and learned to admire the behaviour of

the English judges on the bench, announced that he emulated their example, and intended to conduct himself without bias against the accused. In this particular he departed from the custom of his office. The glory of the French judge is to produce conviction; the duty of the English judge, even when the accused was allowed no counsel, was always to protect the prisoner from wrong, and now is to hold the beam in equipoise.

From this hysterical court-room it is a relief to cross the channel, and there in the Tichborne case we find the most remarkable trial ever known. The witnesses are numbered by hundreds rather than by scores or dozens; the length of the speeches of counsel is measured by weeks rather than by hours, and that of the trial itself by months rather than by days or weeks. We understand that the jury, who, before the trial, were strangers to one another, have become the most intimate friends, and have contracted matrimonial alliances among their children. It is quite certain that unless Parliament interferes with a pecuniary grant in their behalf, those of the jury who are dependent on the prosecution of business will suffer very great damage in their material interests. It is to be feared, too, that Dr. Kenaly, the claimant's counsel, will irrecoverably lose his temper in one of his frequent sallies of passion. But after all, that gentleman is deserving of great sympathy, single-handed as he is against the Crown prosecutors, engaged in an action in which it takes him three weeks to state his case to the jury, and enlisted in behalf of a client whom he finds it necessary to stigmatize, although claiming to be an English baronet, as a rogue and a brute. . . . The case is a remarkable one, also, on account of the frequent collisions between the prisoner's counsel and the judges. We dare say Dr. Kenaly's temper is rather irascible by nature, and has become somewhat worn in the prolonged conflict, but we cannot refuse our admiration of the indomitable and manly pluck with which he stands up for what he conceives to be the rights of his client and his own privileges as counsel. Nothing nobler has been heard since Erskine, than some of his utterances on this point. As for the judges, we will use our Yankee privilege of "guessing" that it was not from them that the Duc d'Aumale derived his useful lesson on the proper demeanour of the judge. Their conduct has frequently savoured of the tyrannical, and we think that they have, on several occasions, been in danger of affording testimony to the correctness of Samuel Weller's observation, that he never knew a magistrate who didn't commit himself twice as often as he committed anybody else.

Perhaps we have already sufficiently characterised the trial of Tweed. His conviction is one of the healthiest symptoms of the well-being of this republic that we have seen in many a day. It argues the existence of such a thing as a public conscience, a national sense of decency and honour. A few years ago the accused was the most powerful and one of the richest men in the State of New York, and to-day he is a convict in a convict's garb in a prison. Since the abolition of slavery, and the crushing of the rebellion, there has been nothing so apparently impracticable and so triumphantly secured as this result. The course of Tweed's trial, like that of the Claimant's, was marked by encounters between counsel and the bench. Perhaps we ought not to criticise the conduct of the presiding judge in punishing counsel for contempt, when we are ignorant of the contents of the paper handed to him by them, and which constituted the alleged contempt. But this is an ignorance which we share with the rest of the world. Enough has been divulged to show that it was a protest against his presiding in the case for the alleged reason of his bias against the prisoner, imbibed on a former trial. If this were couched in respectful terms, as we presume from the circumstances that it was, we do not see why its authors should be fined. We should regret to have it established as a precedent that a prisoner could not say, in a respectful manner, to his judge that he feared he was biased against him, and that he should prefer to be tried by somebody else. One circumstance alone leads us to suspect that counsel were not quite clear of their own innocence in the matter, and that is, the tameness with which they submitted. Again, we cannot defend the personalities employed by the judge against the prisoner in his sentence. Human nature has certain rights, however erring. Aside from these particulars, the conduct of the judge in this trying position was most exemplary, and we are not disposed to be severely critical when the result worked out was so greatly favourable to the cause of morals, justice, and public decency. The trial has

also done much to confirm the advocates of the jury system, and to silence those who object to it. The agreement of the jury was probably quite unexpected to the majority of observers, and the independent, intelligent, and conscientious action thus manifested, will do much toward re-establishing the public confidence in the integrity of New York juries, and the effective administration of justice in her courts.—

LEGAL ITEMS.

In consequence of illness, Mr. R. Vaughan Williams, judge of the North Wales Circuit, has been obliged to go abroad for a time.

Mr. Chapman Barber, whose appointment as judge of the County Court Circuit No. 16 (East Yorkshire) we recently announced, has resigned that office, and will resume his practice at the bar.

The *Observer* states that a proposition is in course of consideration to abolish the Mansion House as a police-court, and to transfer the business at present transacted there to the Guildhall.

It is announced that the Women's Disabilities' Removal Bill will be introduced in the House of Commons immediately on the opening of the session by Mr. Forsyth, M.P. for Marylebone.

A statement has appeared that, owing to the short time that the House of Lords will meet for business before the Easter recess, it is not expected that appeals will be taken before the 13th of April.

The Great Seal of Ireland is to be placed in Commission, and it is announced that the Commissioners who will be charged with its custody are the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, the Right Hon. Mr. Justice Lawson, and Master Brooke.

At Warwick, on Tuesday, a man was convicted of having, at the municipal election for Birmingham, practised intimidation in order to induce an elector to refrain from voting for a candidate. The prisoner was sentenced to one week's imprisonment.

The Chancellor's medal for legal studies at Cambridge has been awarded to Mr. E. H. S. Nugent, B.A., Trinity College. Mr. Nugent was Senior in the Law Tripos of 1870, and obtained the Senior Whewell Scholarship in International Law in 1871.

Parliamentary election petitions have now been lodged in the Common Pleas Office from the following places:—Hackney, Kidderminster, Stockport, Wakefield, Windsor, Petersfield, Dudley, Boston, Barnstaple, Bolton, Haverfordwest, Stroud, and Luncannon.

We learn from the *Canada Law Journal* that a new thing in law has recently occurred in New Jersey. Mr. Cortlandt Parker, an eminent counsel of Newark, not being able to be present in the Court of Errors, telegraphed his brief to the Chief Justice. The brief was read to the Court, and answered the purpose.

The Court of Queen's Bench, says the *Times* reporter, commenced the Guildhall sittings with a list of 214 causes; of these 80 causes have been tried, withdrawn, or struck out. This leaves 134 remainets, 111 of which are special jury cases. The list of remainets of special jury cases left at the end of the last sittings is not yet cleared off, so that not one of the special jury cases entered for these sittings has been tried.

Mr. E. S. Gordon M.P., Dean of Faculty, presented his commission of Lord Advocate for Scotland to the Lords of Session on Saturday last. The ceremony took place in the First Division Court-room, before a full bench, in the presence of a large number of ladies as well as members of the bar and other gentlemen. Mr. Gordon, who wore court dress, handed his commission to the Lord President, and thereafter he subscribed the oaths, and was invested with the robe of office. At a later hour the Lord Advocate presented his commission to the Lords of Justiciary.

We have, says the *Canada Law Journal*, repudiated the wig which is an inseparable ornament of justice in the mother country. Can it be that the white tie is in danger? We are apprised of two cases in which counsel ventured on the revolutionary proceeding of addressing the Court without assuming the white tie. The Court very

properly intimated that, although, by the exercise of faculties it had in common with ordinary mortals, it was aware of an individual addressing remarks in its direction, in its judicial capacity it was unable to see or hear anything.

In the course of a cause heard a few days ago in the Probate Court, the learned judge referred to a growing practice on the part of suitors of addressing private letters to him. He said—The defendant has addressed to me a letter in this matter, but it is well that suitors should know, and should be made aware of the fact, that it is grossly improper to address private communications to the judge, and that when once I learn that the communication proceeds from a suitor I do not read it, but hand it to the counsel in the cause, to be made use of, if it be of use, by either side.

Lord Coleridge presided at the Nisi Prius Court at the Berkshire Assizes at Reading on Monday, and in an action for ejectment asked Mr. Bosanquet, one of the plaintiff's counsel, if he would kindly supply the defects of an Oxford education by informing him what measurement was represented by a perch mentioned in one of the leases produced in the course of the case. The inquiry occasioned some laughter, and Mr. Bosanquet explained that a perch varied—it was not the same in all counties, but in most cases it was understood to mean sixteen feet.

On Thursday Mr. Edlin, Q.C., who has been appointed Assistant Judge of the Middlesex Sessions, in succession to Sir William Bodkin, was sworn in. Congratulatory addresses to the new judge were made by Mr. Pownall, on behalf of the magistrates, and Mr. Brindley, on behalf of the bar. Mr. Serjeant Cox, in offering his congratulations, remarked that he had certainly hoped that long services would have led to his (Serjeant Cox's) appointment to the office, the duties of which he had so long discharged. But he added that no better man than Mr. Edlin could have been found for the post.

"A Barrister," writing to the *Daily News* of Tuesday, says—"Probably until Saturday last the spectacle was unprecedented of a Lord Chief Justice of England, or indeed of any judge of a superior court, almost directly soliciting an expression of approval from the bar before him, and being rewarded by a suppressed cheer. Sir Alexander Cockburn declares his indifference as to the persons by whom, or the spirit in which, the history of the late trial may be written. He may very well be heedless. In the main, his part in it will redound to his honour. No malignant *asinus* can permanently distort or conceal the facts. But the most candid and careful historian, by virtue of his very candour and his carefulness to be just, will be forced to deplore a certain indecorum of language, and an unchastened violence of demeanour, unbecoming the august place occupied by the first magistrate of the country."

The Court of Assizes of the Seine has just been occupied in trying a man named Ruant on a charge of forgery. The prisoner, a man of thirty-two years of age, had an office in the Rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, where he carried on business as a law agent. The method he adopted was to supply false documents in the cases entrusted to him. His range of practice in that way was extensive, including registers, orders of court, powers of attorney, &c. He imitated the signatures of judges, huissiers, officials of all sorts, avoués, and, in fact, those of any one he might consider necessary to give an appearance of verity to his nefarious proceedings. By those means he not only succeeded in fleecing his clients of fees which he stated he had paid, and defrauding the State; he had even gone so far as to procure stamps, with which he imitated the seals of the tribunals, &c. The facts having been fully proved, the jury found him guilty, but with extenuating circumstances, and he was sentenced to five years' imprisonment and 100*fr.* fine.

One of the Code Commissioners of California was recently written to on the subject of a case for which no provision had been made by the Code, and the *Express* gives the following as the substance of his reply:—"He wrote that it was a bad thing, and that he didn't see what was to be done about it; but that the Commission was not responsible for it; that all they had done was to copy the Code of that eminent codifier Mr. David Dudley Field,

that it was evidently the intention of the Legislature that the Commission should pursue this course; for if they had wanted a new Code made they certainly should have known better than to refer the matter to them; that it couldn't be expected that a commission of three men, without any special training or experience for the purpose, could complete in two years a work for which Justinian had found it necessary to employ the great Tribonian and seventeen other of the most eminent lawyers in the Empire during many years; a work, finally, so extensive that it had taken even Mr. David Dudley Field some time to accomplish it. As for himself, he said he never had pretended to be much of a codifier, but the position was offered to him with a good salary and he didn't feel called upon to decline it; and, finally, that the whole Commission reminded him very forcibly of Pantagruel's opinion of the French lawyers, which he quoted as follows: 'Seeing that the law is excepted out of the very middle of moral and natural philosophy, how should these fools have understood it, who have studied less in philosophy than my mule.'

On Tuesday last the Master of the Rolls was for the third time called on to construe a passage in the late Lord Westbury's will. Two more difficult documents to construe than this will and this settlement of the late learned lord he said he had never seen. He would have been glad to decline to construe either of them, on the ground that they could not be construed, but for a decision of the late Lord Westbury himself which precluded the Court from taking that course. The *Times* has the following amusing remarks on this subject:—"We cannot but congratulate Sir George Jessel upon the singularly happy chance which has enabled him thus to sit in judgment upon Lord Westbury's legal qualifications. Lord Westbury was a law reformer of the precise type which has always been most offensive to lawyers. With the penal code, at least of this world, Lord Westbury did not concern himself; but he endeavoured in more than one way to improve and simplify the laws that relate to property, and he threatened further changes, far more extensive, which he had not the opportunity of effecting. This he did in the interest, not of the lawyers, but of the public; and the natural result was that innumerable blots were found in such Acts as he succeeded in passing. His decisions were criticized in no friendly spirit, and both together were often so interpreted or applied as to add considerably to the intricacies which they had been intended to remove. There were other reasons, too, which made Lord Westbury very far from a favourite among the members of his own profession. The delightful task of attacking such a man's performances is rendered doubly sweet when it is done at his own expense, and when his own estate is compelled to pay the cost of the blunders which he can be convicted of having committed. Sir George Jessel, not himself an enthusiastic law reformer, would have been more than human if he had not availed himself of the chance. If anything in this world could have summoned back to us for a time the shade of the illustrious dead, it would have been the terms of the decision in the Rolls' Court on Tuesday last. What a sight and what a hearing that would have been for those who had dared to find fault with the deeds and language of departed greatness! The magnificently contemptuous wave of the hand which would have dismissed the offending judge, the short, neatly-balanced sentences which would have compressed into a few words the quintessence of all sarcasm, the air, all together would have completed a scene worthy even of Dante's Muse."

COURT PAPERS.

NOTICE.—MARCH, 1874.

The following regulations for transacting the business at the judges' chambers will be observed until further notice:—

Summonses will be issued and made returnable at eleven o'clock at the chambers of the judges of the court in which the actions are pending.

As to applications to be made to the Lord Chief Justice.

Acknowledgments of deeds will be taken at eleven o'clock. Adjourned summonses will be heard first at eleven o'clock, and the summonses of the day will be taken immediately

afterwards. Counsel will be heard at half-past twelve o'clock.

As to applications to be made to the Masters.

Adjourned summonses will be heard at eleven o'clock precisely in each court, and the summonses of the day immediately afterwards. Counsel will be heard at twelve o'clock; and the Lord Chief Justice directs particular attention to the rules of Michaelmas Term, 1867, and desires it to be distinctly understood that he will not hear any summonses or application, directed by the said rules to be heard by the Masters, unless such summonses or application shall be specially referred to him by the Master.

Counsel.

Whenever a summons is served with notice to attend by counsel, the name of counsel (if known) should be written on the copy summons served upon the opposite party.

The Lord Chief Justice will not attend chambers on Saturdays. By Order.

COMMON PLEAS AT LANCASTER.

The Right Honourable Thomas Edward Taylor, Chancellor of the Duchy and County Palatine of Lancaster (with the advice and consent of the Honourable George Denman, Chief Justice, and the Honourable Sir Richard Paul Amphlett, one of the Justices of the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster), in pursuance of the Common Pleas at Lancaster Amendment Act, 1869, and in pursuance and execution of all other powers enabling him in this behalf, doth, and the said Chief Justice and Justice, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, passed in the session of Parliament, held in the 4th and 5th years of the reign of his late Majesty King William the Fourth, intituled "An Act for improving the Practice and Proceedings of the Court of Common Pleas of the County Palatine of Lancaster," and in pursuance and execution of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, the Common Law Procedure Act, 1860, and of all other powers and authorities enabling them in this behalf, do make and publish the following General Rules, and order and direct as follows:—

1. The provisional entry of causes for trial shall not be made at Preston as directed by the Orders of Spring Assizes, 1868, but causes for trial at Manchester may be entered provisionally at the office of the District Prothonotary and Deputy Associate in Manchester; and causes for trial at Liverpool may be entered provisionally at the office of the Prothonotary and Associate in Liverpool.

2. The Registry of Executions, &c., for the County Palatine of Lancaster shall be kept by the Prothonotary at Liverpool, instead of at Preston, as mentioned in the 7th of the General Rules and Orders of the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster of 6th September, 1870.

3. Except as aforesaid, the said Orders of the Spring Assizes, 1868, and the General Rules and Orders of 23rd October, 1869, as varied by the General Rules and Orders of 6th September, 1870, shall remain in force.

4. These rules shall come into operation on the 19th day of March, 1874.

Dated this 3rd day of March, 1874.

(Signed)

T. EDWARD TAYLOR.
GEORGE DENMAN.
R. PAUL AMPHLETT.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, MAR. 6, 1874.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuitants, April, '73 8½
Do. for Account, April '73	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
3 per Cent. Reduced 90½ x d	Ex Bill, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2½ dis
New 3 per Cent. 90½ x d	Do. 2500, Do 2½ dis
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '74	Do. 2100 & 2200, 2½ dis
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '74	Bank of England Stock, 5
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ct. (last half-year) 236
Annuitants, Jan. '80 —	Do. for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 104½ Ct. Apr. '74, 205	Ind. Inf. Fr., 3 p Ct. Jan. '73
Do. for Account, —	Do. 3½ per Cent., May '73 101½
Do. 5 per Cent., July, '80 107½	Do. Debentures, per Cent.,
Do. for Account, —	April, '84 —
Do. 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 102 x d	Do. Do. 3 per Cent., Aug. '73 100½
Do. ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Do. Infused Fr., 1 per Cent. 95½	Do. ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	123
Stock	Caledonian	100	100½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	103
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	46 x d
Stock	Great Northern	100	136½
Stock	Do., A Stock	100	160
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	112
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	129½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	144½
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	83½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	22½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	146½ x d
Stock	London and South Western	100	108½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	75½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	65½
Stock	Do., District	100	32½
Stock	Midland	100	131½ x d
Stock	North British	100	63½
Stock	North Eastern	100	70½ x d
Stock	North London	100	113
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	64
Stock	South Devon	100	68
Stock	South-Eastern	100	110½

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

No alteration was made on Thursday in the Bank rate. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has fallen from 49·16 to 47·62. There has been more firmness in the railway market during the week, and at the close on Thursday there was a general advance in prices. In foreign stocks, also, there has been more activity than for some time. French scrip has advanced in price, and at one time on Thursday reached 10½ premium.

At the recent meeting of the Mutual Life Assurance Society the following report was presented:—"The revenue account and balance-sheet for 1873, which the directors have the pleasure to lay before the members, are ready for deposit at the Board of Trade, and are prepared in the manner prescribed by the Life Assurance Companies Act, 1870, which is now generally adopted. In this form comparisons can easily be made with accounts of other offices, and members of the Mutual can without difficulty ascertain the comparative position of the society. The accounts appended hereto present the following characteristics:—1. Increase in the total assurances and policies in force; 2. in the assurance fund; 3. in the new assurances effected during the year; 4. in the new premiums; 5. in the rate of interest on investments; 6. in the expenses of management; and 7. a decrease in the amount of claims. The total assurances now in force amount to £3,477,374, under 4,417 policies. The assurance fund has increased in the past year from £769,538 to £802,381. The new assurances have increased from 189 policies, assuring £96,506 in 1872, to 249 policies, assuring £150,140 completed in 1873, being an increase of 56 per cent. in the twelve months. The new premiums have increased from £3,113 in 1872, to £4,639 in 1873, being an increase of 49 per cent. The rate of interest on the total cash assets of the society has increased from £4 3s. 4d. per cent. in 1872 to £4 7s. 2d. in 1873, being equivalent to a clear gain to the society of about £1,540 a-year on the interest account alone. The expenses of management have increased by £1,116 in the year. Against this is to be set a largely increased new business, which is steadily developing, and an increased new premium income for 1873 of £1,526 over that of 1872. The increase on the average rate of interest of 3s. 10d. per cent., which on £802,381 is about £1,540, brings a total of over £3,066 per annum to the credit of the revenue account as a result of the extra expenditure of the society during the past year. The directors have pleasure in stating that the claims for 1873 are only £58,285, against claims in 1872 amounting to £61,054. Notices to the members giving the particulars of the sums which will be added to their policies in the event of their becoming claims in 1874 will be sent out as soon as possible. The chairman, in addressing the meeting, added, "I think the result of our exertions for 1873 shows that we have within us a property valuable to an extent that we have not yet had developed; but having reached the important point we have reached, and—I wish to draw your attention strongly to this—having a larger percentage of accumulated property compared with our liabilities than almost any office in existence, I think we can say

that we have done our business on sound and judicious principles. Nothing is a better test of the importance of insurance office than to show that the percentage of accumulated wealth is larger in proportion than that of many offices which do a larger business, because we have something to fall back upon in the event of the calculations as to mortality going a little beyond what we have a right to expect. You will doubtless have observed that the claims have decreased very considerably during the past year. The calculation was that they would reach something like what they did in 1871 and 1872, but they are some three or four thousand pounds below that amount. That is an agreeable feature, and I do not know I can say more excepting this, that the year opens with very satisfactory results, and we have already done an amount of business which lends a more agreeable contrast to the commencement of a new year than for many years past. If we can only go on in the same ratio as we have commenced, we shall have a still more prosperous year in 1874 than in 1873." The report was adopted unanimously. The chairman, in reply to some remarks made by Mr. Danphy, said that he expressed his own opinion as well as those of the directors in stating that they had decided to continue to receive proposals for £50 and upwards, believing it to be an encouragement to thrift and economy. After a vote of thanks to Mr. Tully, the actuary, the meeting ended.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGE, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BEDFORD—On Feb. 27, at the Briars, Kingston-on-Thames, the wife of E. Henslow Bedford, of a daughter.
BLAKE—On Feb. 26, at 20, Stanley-gardens, Notting-hill, the wife of Charles Henry Blake, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.
ELLETT—On March 1, at Cirencester, the wife of Robert Ellett, Esq., of a son.
EVERITT—On March 1, at 27, Cleveland-square, Hyde-park, the wife of F. W. E. Everitt, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, of a son.
MACNAGHTEN—On March 2, at 100, Eaton-place, the wife of Edward Macnaghten, Esq., of a son.
ROWLAND—On March 3, at Hampton, the wife of F. A. A. Rowland, solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

JONES—LAVER—On Feb. 23, at St. Andrew's, Wells-street, Francis Augustus Jones, solicitor, Chelmsford, to Bessie, widow of the late Samuel Laver, Carlisle.

DEATHS.

ANDERSON—On Feb. 24, at Long Benton, near Newcastle-on-Tyne, Joseph Anderson, Esq., solicitor.
BROWNE—On Feb. 27, at the Park, Nottingham, Walter Browne solicitor. In the 42nd year of his age.
COX—On Feb. 26, at Putney Park Lodge, George Cox, of No. 4, Cloak-lane, London, solicitor, in his 80th year.
NICHOLS—On Feb. 26, at Farnham, Surrey, Ben Nichols, solicitor, aged 68.
SCOTT—On March 3, at 32, Eccleston-street, William Carmalt Scott, Esq., Judge of County Courts, aged 49.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Auvergne Bituminous Rock and Paving Company, Limited.—V.C. Malins, by an order dated Jan. 30, appointed Frederick Hertram Smart, Cheap-side, and James Marmont, Bury st, St James's to be official liquidators.
Hastings Sewage Manure Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Feb 23, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Saturday, March 7. Carr and Co, Basinghall st, solicitors for the petitioners.
Wine and Spirit Co-operative Supply Association, Limited.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Feb 19, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Chapple and Welch, solicitors for the petitioners.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

General Building Material Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 24, directed to be heard before the Vice-Chancellor, Stone buildings, Lincoln's-inn, on Tuesday, March 6. Evans and Lockett, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner.

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

Ferens Consols Mining Company.—Petition for winding up, directed to be heard before the Vice-Warden, Gwallow place, Brompton, on Monday, March 9 at 12. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing, in opposition to the petition, must be filed at the Registrar's

Office, Truro, on or before March 5, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitor, or his agents. Paul, Truro, solicitor for the petitioner. Gregory and Co, Bedford row, agents.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

Camington 15th May Club Friendly Society, National Schoolroom, Camington, Somerset. Feb 19
City of London Mutual and Philanthropic Waiters' Friendly Society, Coopers' Arms, Budge row, Cannon st. Feb 23
Stake Female Benevolent Friendly Society, Mount Zion Schoolroom Stoke-on-Trent, Stafford. Feb 24

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

Ball, James, Leicester, Gent. March 20. Schwartz v Hamshaw, V.C.
Becon. Hunter, Leicester
Burland, Samuel, Sonsonate, Central America, Merchant. July 1.
Burland v Kerford, Registrar Liverpool District
Caffin, William, Blackheath, Kent, Esq. March 20. Caffin v Caffin
M.R. Ingle and Co, Threadneedle st
Coppard, William, Bennett st, Greenwich, Gent. March 23. Hinder
v Manning, V.C. Hall. Ingle and Co, Threadneedle st
Crowden, William, March, Cambridge, Farmer, April 1. Beck v Crow-
den, V.C. Bacon. Dawbarn and Wise, March
Harding, John, Acre lane, Brixton, Gent. March 26. Dugdale v
Hays, M.R. Lewis, Wilmington square
Morey, Joseph, Putney st, Barnsbury. April 20. Sweet v Morey,
V.C. Malins. Toller, Dean's st, Doctors' commons
Musket, James Fairbairn, High st, Clapham, Florist. April 4. Samp-
son v Musket, V.C. Hall. Neal, Pinners' Hall, Old Broad st
Ormonston, Ralph, Upper Weymouth st, Greengrocer. April 1. Pank-
hurst v Gardner, M.R. Goran, South Molton st, Oxford st
Setcliffe, William, Creadle, Cheshire. March 31. Setcliffe v Dixon,
V.C. Malins. Almond, Manchester

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, Feb. 25, 1874.

Allender, George, Kensington park gardens, Gent. March 31. Paine
and Layton, Gresham house, Old Broad st
Allinson, James, Norton, York, Chemist. April 6. Harrison, New
Walton
Bailley, Jane, Bristol, March 21. Hunt and Co, Bristol
Barnbrook, Ann, Penhall, Lindridge, Worcester. March 31. Norris,
Tenbury
Barrow, Rebecca, Macclesfield, Chester. March 31. Sergeant,
Macclesfield
Beasley, Sidney, Lawrie park, Sydenham, Esq. May 1. Pattison and
Co, Lombard st
Beyers, Joseph, Snowdon, Newlay, Horsforth, York, Gent. May 1.
Turner, Leeds
Bradthwaite, New Millflat, Westmorland. March 13. Thompson
Appleyby
Bristocke, Thomas, Miford, Pembroke, Incumbent. April 20. Bootys
and Bayliffe, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn
Broadwood, Charles Hamilton, Preston, Sussex, Esq. April 15. Upton
and Co, Austin friars
Burden, John, Lodbury, Hereford, Mercer. March 31. Smith, Leabury
Campbell, Sarah Matilda, Atherton, Warwick. March 30. Words-
worth and Co, South Sea House, Threadneedle st
Davies, David, Trawsmawr, Carmarthen, Esq. May 25. Barker,
Carmarthen
Elton, Thomas, Hoff, Appley, Westmorland, Yeoman. March 31.
Thompson, Appleyby
Franklin, William Gilbert, Titchfield, Southampton, Gent. March 31.
Donnithorne, Fareham
Freeman, Richard, Ely, Cambridge, Builder. March 24. Archer and
Son, Ely
Gardner, William, Egham, Surrey, Smith. April 5. Hammond,
Furnival's inn
Griffiths, John, Manchester, Hatter. April 10. Richardson and Co,
Liverpool
Heiderson, John, Ambie, Northumberland, Fish Curer. April 1. Davis,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Huckison, William, Swinton st, Gray's inn rd, Manufacturing
Chemist. March 31. Parker and Co, Bedford row
Jeffs, Sarah, High st, Stoke Newington. April 6. Bicknell and Hortin,
Edgware rd
Johnson, John, Altrincham, Chester, Timber Merchant. April 2.
Fowden, Altrincham
Keen, William, Northmoor, Oxon; Gent. March 25. Walsh, Oxford
Kelham, Charles Bird, The Grove, Camberwell, Colonial Broker. March
31. Kelham, The Grove, Camberwell
Lazarus, Moses, Woburn place, Russell square, Jeweller. March 31.
Woolf, King st, Cheapside
Lee, Fabius, Braddon, Isle of Man, no occupation. April 1. Thompson,
Liverpool
Lord, James, Bramley, Leeds, Yeoman. May 1. Turner, Leeds
Lord, John, Bramley, near Leeds, Grocer. May 1. Turner, Leeds
Lord, Mary, Bramley, Leeds. May 1. Turner, Leeds
Nicholson, Thomas, Gorkie, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Gent. March
25. Brockbank and Helder, Whitehaven
Parker, John, Churton, Chester. March 14. Boydell and Co, Chester
Parsons, George, Southampton, Chief Officer Royal Mail Steam Packet
Company. April 19. Coxwell and Co, Southampton
Penny, Sarah, Abbey rd, St John's wood. April 1. White and Co,
Whitehall place, Westminster
Perriman, James, Waverton, near Liverpool, Clerk. April 1. Thom-
son, Liverpool
Rawlinson, Joshua Colne, Lancashire, Tailor. March 16. Backhouse
and Whiteham, Burnley
Roberts, Charles, Holloway rd, Licensed Victualler. March 31. Par-
kinson, Holloway rd
Roberts, John, Hempnall, Norfolk, Woodman. March 28. Motson and
Furness, Long Stratton

Rooke, Sarah Elizabeth, Barnton, Chester. March 20. Tyrrell, Gray's
inn square
Twelvrees, Robert, Biggleswade, Bedford, Baker. March 25. Hooper
and Rayner, Biggleswade
Wallis, Henry, Southampton, Builder. April 20. Hickman and Son,
Southampton
Wells, John Tadley, Southampton, Gent. April 5. Cave, Newbury
Woolverton, James, Bramley, Surrey, Gent. April 15. Mellerah,
Godalming

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

Adams, Thomas Cuffe, Ewell, near Dover, Kent, Esq. April 1. Young
and Co, St Mildred's court, Poultry
Austen, William, Eastgate, Croydon, Esq. March 31. Hogan,
Martin's lane, Cannon st
Avery, William, Bristol, out of business. March 25. Peters, Bristol
Aylen, John, Lieutenant R.N. March 25. Hallett, St Martin's
place, Trafalgar square
Baldwin, George, Brighton, Sussex, Builder. March 25. Woods and
Dempster, Brighton
Baxter, Mary, Clitheroe, Lancashire, Innkeeper. April 13. Hull and
Baldwin, Clitheroe
Beck, Elizabeth, Washington, Sussex. March 31. Wright, Ironmonger's
hall, Fenchurch st
Bulloch, Archibald, Lancashire gate, Hyde Park, Distiller. May 1.
Woolf, King st, Cheapside
Cholmer, Eleanor Elizabeth, Landan, Percy villas, Camden Hill rd,
Kensington. April 30. Bannister and Each, John st, Bedford row
Cooke, John, Claremont square, Pantonsville, Gent. April 1. Taylor
and Co, Great James st, Bedford row
Cope, Mary Ann, Westbourne rd, Barnsbury. March 24. Mackeson
and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Counens, John, Southsea, Hants, Licensed Victualler. April 14.
Pearce and Son, Portsea
Curwen, Jane Phillips, Lupton, Westmorland. March 31. Milburn,
Workington
Eward, John, sen, Naseby, Northampton, Farmer. March 25.
Andrew, Brixworth
Forth, Lucy, Bridlington, York, Hatter. June 1. Harland, Bridling-
ton
Green, St John, Bedford, Esq. May 30. Pearce, Bedford
Hinson, Thomas, Nottingham, Coach Builder. March 31. Acton,
Nottingham
Jones, Julia, Birmingham. April 23. Jelf and Goule, Birmingham
Jones, Thomas, Birmingham, Pearl Handle Maker. April 23. Jelf
and Goule, Birmingham
Lawton, William, Nottingham, Woolen Merchant. April 2. Thorpe
and Thorpe, Nottingham
Lanton, John Henry, Coventry, Gent. May 1. Davis, Coventry
Lloyd, Robert Newman, Stock Exchange. May 4. Wabber, jun,
Wandsworth rd
Lobach, Augustus Leo, Walpole st, Chelsea, Esq. April 9. Paine and
Hammond, Furnival's inn
Loch, Philip William, Lucas st, Commercial rd East, Paper Dealer.
March 31. Whitwell, King st, Cheapside
Marshall, Thomas, Bristol, Gent. April 6. Sweet and Burroughs,
Bristol
Neal, William, Elliott rd, Vassall rd, Brixton, Gent. May 4. Batty,
Dyera's Hall
Nook, Gertrude Elizabeth, Woodside House, Gipsy hill. April 7.
Maddox and Green, Waterloo place, Pall Mall
Osborne, John, Redditch, Worcester, Gent. April 6. Amphlett,
Redditch
Parker, Margaret, Badsworth, York. April 13. Pratt and Hodgkin-
sons, Newark-upon-Trent
Paterson, William Boyd Alexander Frederick, Richford at, Hammer-
smith, Esq. March 25. Nunn, Bedford row
Rogers, William, Elkstone, Gloucester, Farmer. March 31. Mullings
and Co, Cirencester
Smith, Thomas, Park rd, Hornsey. April 20. Potter, King st, Cheap-
side
Stephens, Thomas, Lime st square, Insurance Broker. April 1.
Hensman and Nicholson, College hill
Sweetman, Thomas, Brighton, Sussex, Gent. May 1. Olake and
Howlett, Brighton
Topping, Richard, Trentham, Staff'd. Gent. May 1. Stevenson,
Stoke-upon-Trent
Weston, Mary, Oak rd, Union rd, Battersea. May 4. Webber,
Wandsworth rd
Williames, Lumley Buckley, Welchpool, Montgomery, Esq. May 1.
Jones, Welchpool
Woodthorpes, Frederick, Cambridge Villa, Haverstock hill, Gent.
April 13. Michael, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st

TUESDAY, March 3, 1874.

Aylmer, George William, Upper Grosvenor st, Esq. April 15. Collyer-
Bristow and Co, Bedford row
Aylmer, Henrietta, Upper Grosvenor st. April 15. Collyer-Bristow
and Co, Bedford row
Beaumont, Jane, Cheltenham, Gloucester. April 1. Winterbotham
and Co, Cheltenham
Bennett, Anne Gibson, Charlwood rd, Putney. April 6. Nicholson
and Co, Lime st
Bennett, John Leech, Merton, Surrey; Esq. April 4. Mackrell and Co,
Cannon st
Bentley, Elizabeth Ann, Brighton, Sussex. May 1. Torr and Co,
Bedford row
Calton, George, Blomfield rd, Maida Hill, Gent. April 21. Bicknell
and Horton, Edgware rd
Cox, Wiltshire, Ostend, Belgium, Gent. May 1. Mes, Great Win-
cheser at buildings
Curling, Elizabeth, Eastbourne, Sussex. April 10. Baker and Nairne,
Cromby square
Dixon, William, Gressingham, Lancashire, Yeoman. April 14. Picard,
Kirby Lonsdale
Dugdale, John Frank, Morehead, Somerset, Gent. May 31. Warden
and Fensford, Barden near Tanton
Evans, George, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Architect. April 30.
Tanner, Wimborne Minster

Green, John, Hayton, Cumberland, Farmer. April 26. Hayton and Simpson, Cockermouth
Grinling, Charles George, Ebury st, Pimlico, Licensed Victualler. March 31. Surtees, Bedford row
Groves, William John, Thomas st, Horsleydown, Lighterman. April 15. Young and Sons, Mark lane
Hall, Benjamin, Longholme, near Rawtenstall, Lancashire. Joiner. March 31. Townsend, Rawtenstall
Halliday, William, Leigh, Lancashire, Innkeeper. March 25. Marsh and Son, Leigh
Hern, David, Blackbourn, Oxford, Yeoman. April 30. Skinner, Bampton
Holmes, George Edward, Colnbrook, Buckingham, Butcher. March 28. Phillips, Windsor
Jones, Henry Bence, Brook st, Grosvenor square. April 1. Farrer and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
MacAndrew, Robert, Islesworth House, Esq. April 15. Kendall and Congreve, Union Bank chambers, Lincoln's inn
Priest, Sophia, Upper Seymour st, Connaught square. April 20. Holt and Son, Guildford
Rogers, Thomas, Marlborough rd, Peckham, Gent. March 30. Chinery and Aldridge, Essex st, Strand
Ross, McCulloch, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Gent. May 3. Wing and DuCane, Gray's inn square
Scott, Mary, Edge hill, near Liverpool. April 5. Norris and Sons, Liverpool
Statham, Thomas, Exeter, Gent. March 25. Geare and Co, Exeter
Weber, Charles Frederick, Royal Exchange buildings, Merchant. April 13. Denby, Frederick's place, Old Jewry

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Fowler, James, High st, Peplar, Grocer. Pet. Feb 24. Hazlitt March 11 at 11
Irvine, Clark Arthur, Abingdon villas, Kensington, Barrister at law. Pet Feb 23. Brougham. March 13 at 11
Westmerland, Frederick George, Billiter square, Shipbroker. Pet Feb 25. Spring-Rice. March 13 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Farrow, William Morley, Chappel, Essex, Author. Pet Feb 25. Barnes Colchester, March 11 at 12
Pear, Thomas, and Thomas John Glew, Manchester, Potato Salesman. Pet Feb 25. Kay. Manchester, March 19 at 9.30
Rhys, C. Wandle rd, Wandsworth Common, no business. Pet Feb 10. Willoughby. Wandsworth, March 13 at 11

TUESDAY, March 3, 1874.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Bremner, George William, Mansion House buildings, Queen Victoria st, Commission Merchant. Pet Feb 27. Murray. March 17 at 11
Nicoll, Henry, Hatchett's Hotel, Dover st, Colonel. Pet Feb 28. Roche. March 19 at 11
Stevens, Alfred, Prince of Wales rd, Haverstock hill, Surgeon. Pet Feb 27. Murray. March 17 at 12

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

Berry, Martha, Liverpool, Brewer. Feb 20

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 27, 1874.

Abbott, William Joseph, Pilton, Devon, Paper Manufacturer. March 13 at 2 at offices of Thorne, Cross st. Barnstable
Aspen, James, Manchester, Fustian Dealer. March 17 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Kerslaw, Booth st, Manchester. Holden and Holden, Bolton

Astridge, William, Westbourne, Sussex, Grocer. March 13 at 4 at offices of Edmonds and Co, St James st, Portsea. King, Portsea
Allison, Adam Stainby, and Charles Oscar Lawrence, Rochdale Lancashire. Boot Dealer. March 11 at 3 at the Wheatsheaf Hotel, Fennel st, Manchester. Standing, Rochdale

Attwood, William Henry, Luton, Bedford, Carpenter. March 16 at 2 at the George Hotel, George st, Luton. Treherne and Wolferton, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside

Barnard, Simon, Mordon terrace, Hammersmith, Boot Maker. March 13 at 2 at offices of Rogers and Baron, Moorgate st
Baxter, Benjamin, Colchester, Essex, Grocer. March 6 at 3 at the Red Lion Hotel, Colchester. Jones, Colchester

Berry, George, Uckfield, Sussex, Miller. March 13 at 12 at the Crown Hotel, Lewes. Stiff, Eastbourne

Birmingham, Thomas, Broadclat, Devon, Builder. March 13 at 11 at office of Harris and Co, Gandy chambers, Exeter. Huggins, Exeter
Bonfellow, James Onesimus, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Auctioneer. March 13 at 11 at office of Rayson, Regent st, Great Yarmouth

Boylett, Daniel, Worplesdon, Surrey, Smith. March 14 at 2 at the County and Borough Halls, Guildford

Brantingham, John, Marshall st, Golden square, Baker. March 13 at 4 at office of Young and Sons, Mark lane

Bright, Charles, Freshwell st, Horsleydown, Boot Manufacturer. March 17 at 2 at office of Mogg, Bishopgate without. Christmas, Waltham

Brimley, George Edward, Halifax, York, Grocer. March 12 at 11 at office of Norris and Co, Halifax

Brooke, George, Batley, York, Commission Agent. March 13 at 10 at office of Woole, Exchange buildings, Commercial st, Batley

Burke, Lawrence, Mill st, Dockhead, Grocer. March 9 at 3 at office of Chipperfield and Sturt, Trinity st, Southwark

Chathurn, Joseph Jordan, Manchester, Fent Dealer. March 12 at 13 at offices of Stevenson and Co, Chancery place, Manchester

Cousins, Richard William, Swansea, Glamorgan, Chronometer Maker. March 16 at 11 at offices of Davies and Hartland, Rutland st, Swansea

Cox, Charles, Kettering, Northampton, Leather Dealer. March 12 at 12 at offices of Beale and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Coxon, Frederick, Boston, Lincoln, Blacksmith. March 12 at 11 at office of York, Boston

Crocker, Joseph, Ramsgate, Kent, Sailmaker. March 9 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern. Edwards, Ramsgate

Daniels, Thomas, Upper Hellesdon, Norwich, Butcher. March 13 at 4 at office of Sadd, Church st, Theatre st, Norwich

Dickinson, Richard, Liverpool, Boot Manufacturer. March 12 at 3 at offices of Carmichael, Lord st, Liverpool

Duprez, John Louis Philip, Plymouth, Devon, Photographer. March 17 at 11 at office of Edmonds and Son, Parade Plymouth

Edwards, John, Buckley, Flint Joiner. March 13 at 12 at offices of Duncan and Pritchard, Bridge st, Cheshire

Ely, John, Great Bridge, Stafford, Tube Manufacturer. March 11 at 11 at offices of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury

Evans, Charles, Brynswell Marden, near Hereford, Builder. March 13 at 12 at Simpson's Hotel, Hereford. Rose and Co, Chancery lane

Falkin, William, Rothwell, near Leeds, Farmer. March 12 at 2 at office of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds

French, Thomas, Morpeth rd, Roman rd, Old Ford, Boot Manufacturer. March 9 at 10 at the Victoria Tavern, Morpeth rd, Bethnal Green

Long, Landatoun terrace, Grove rd, Victoria Park

Gibson, John, Middlesborough, York, Accountant. March 12 at 11 at offices of Bennisson and Co, Zealand rd, Middlesborough. Dobson, Middlesborough

Godden, John, Elington, Kent, Draper. March 12 at 1 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Ashford

Groom, William Samuel, and Michael Alfred Reed, Mincling lane, Brokers. March 12 at 2 at 2, East India avenue, Leadenhall st. Beck

Hardcastle, Charles, York, Rag Merchant. March 12 at 11 at offices of Young, Castlegate, York

Hesketh, William Pemberton, Margate, Kent, Brewer. March 13 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Calkin, Great James st

Holt, Charles, Coventry, Accountant. March 11 at 12 at offices of Minister, Trinity Church yard, Coventry

Horn, William, Penrith, Cumberland, Staymaker. March 14 at 2 at office of James, Middlegate, Penrith

Houston, James, Crewe, Cheshire, Tailor. March 14 at 10 at offices of Cooke, Temple chambers, Crewe

Jackson, George Langham, London rd, Bromley-by-Bow, Butcher. March 11 at 3 at offices of Wood and Hare, Basinghall st

Jetter, John, Green st, Bethnal Green. March 18 at 2.30 at offices of Paterson, Bouverie st

Jones, John, and George Edwards, Birmingham, Builders. March 12 at 11 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Jordan, George Henry, Luton, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer. March 17 at 1 at offices of Jeffery, King st, Luton

Joyce, James Smith, Brixton, Brewer. March 13 at 2 at office of Harper and Co, Road lane

Kelly, John Cookson, Jun, Gray's-inn-rd, Bag Manufacturer. March 18 at 3 at office of Dalton and Jesse, Clement's lane, Lombard st

Kenyon, Ralph, Blackburn, Lancashire, Tea Merchant. March 13 at 11 at offices of Backhouse, St John's place, Blackburn

Laming, George Thomas, Gosport, Hants, Hardwareman. March 19 at 4 at office of Edmonds and Co, St James st, Portsea. King, Portsea

Lawson, Herbert Clayton, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Stock Broker. March 11 at 16 at 28, Bridge st, Birkenhead

Leach, Henry, Tedegar rd, Bow, Old Ale Merchant. March 17 at 2 at offices of Blachford and Riches, Great Swanalley, Moorgate st

Lidwell, Joshua Edward, High st, Notting Hill, Chemist. March 13 at 3 at offices of Smart and Co, Cheapside. Spaul, Verulam buildings, Gray's inn

Lipson, Jacob, Liverpool, Fent Dealer. March 17 at 3 at offices of Marriott and Woodall, Norfolk st, Manchester

Lyster, Samuel, Jun, Rotherham, York, out of business. March 11 at 3 at offices of Gee, Fig Tree chambers, Sheffield

London, Edward Trowbridge, Wilts, Inspector on the G. W. R. Co. March 7 at 1 at the Market House, Trowbridge. Shrapnell, Bradford-on-Avon

Lovell, John Thomas, Louth, Lincoln, Grocer. March 16 at 3 at office of Mason and Falkner, Eastgate, Louth

Margotta, Joseph William, Kingsland rd, Stationer. March 13 at 2 at offices of Poole, Bartholomew close

Meekins, Algernon, Lewisham, Kent, Licensed Victualler. March 17 at 2 at offices of Payne, Sergeant's inn, Temple

Mollett, William Bell, Norwich, Boat Builder. March 10 at 11 at offices of Wright, Queen st, Norwich

Moyley, Richard, Rounton rd, Campbell rd, Bow, Carpenter. March 12 at 3 at offices of Wood and Hare, Basinghall st

Moroney, William, Bowling, Bradford, York, Millwright. March 5 at 10 at offices of Rhodes, Duke st, Bradford

Morris, Edward, Tornyrefall, near Pontypidd, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. March 10 at 1 at the Angeli Hotel, Cardiff

Morris, Laurence, Rotherham, York, Butcher. March 11 at 4 at office of Gee, Fig Tree chambers, Sheffield

Morton, William, sen, and Edmund Morton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Fruit Merchants. March 9 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Newman, Henry, Ramsgate, Kent, out of business. March 11 at 3 at offices of Treherne and Wolferton, Eppingham st, Ramsgate

Nicholls, Richard, High Holborn, Medicated Cloth Manufacturer. March 17 at 1 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Reed and Lovell, Basinghall st

Nicholls, William, Willenhall, Stafford, Grocer. March 11 at 11 at offices of Cresswell, New rd, Willenhall

O'Neill, John, Church st, St John's, Horsleydown, Grocer. March 11 at 12 at 4 Dyer's buildings, Holborn. Dyer, March 19 at 3 at office of Bennisson and Co, Zealand rd, Middlesborough. Dobson, Middlesborough

Potter, Henry, Barnet, Hertford, Shoemaker. March 12 at 3 at offices of Wells, Paternoster row

Patrick, Charles, Bedford gardens, Campden Hill rd, Kensington, Commercial Traveller. March 12 at 3 at offices of Harper and Co, Road lane

Powell, Henry John, Clerkenwell, Theatrical Manager. March 16 at 11 at the Sadlers' Wells Theatre, Clerkenwell. Goatly

Prager, Henry, Sheffield, Steel and Railway Spring Manufacturer. March 11 at 12 at the Cutlers' Hall, Church st, Sheffield. Tattershall, Sheffield

Pratt, David, Birmingham, Thimble Manufacturer. March 10 at 11 at office of Davies, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Ralph, George, Sandwich, Kent, Coal Merchant. March 14 at 2 at the Fleur de Lis Hotel, Sandwich. Elmonds, Deal

Rae, Richard, Tregunter rd, South Kensington, Clerk in Holy Orders. March 19 at 2 at offices at Tilley and Liggins, Finsbury place South

Reay, Joseph, Cockermouth, Cumberland, Grocer. March 12 at 11 at office of Wicks, Castlegate, Cockermouth

Redburn, Joe William, and John Shaw Redfearn, Huddersfield, York Woollen Manufacturers. March 11 at 3 at offices of Clough and Son, Market st, Huddersfield

Reed, Henry, National Green rd, Corn Chandler. March 6 at 10 at office of Hope, S. R. e. st, Lincoln's inn fields

Reynolds, John James, Peterborough, Northampton, Dyer. March 9 at 12 at office of Gaches, Cathedral gateway, Peterborough

Roe, Thomas, Bristol, Pot to Dealer. March 7 at 11 at office of Essery, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol

Rogers, George, Oxford, Grocer. March 16 at 2 at office of Cooper, Pembroke st, Oxford

Sanderson, Henry, West Hartlepool, Durham, Grocer. March 11 at 12 at office of Dobins and Simpson, Church st, West Hartlepool

Sanders, Mary Prudence, Liverpool, Ladies' Outfitter. March 11 at 2 at offices of Rogers, Lord st, Liverpool

Shield, Henry William, Westmoreland place, Westbourn Park, Barrister's Clerk. March 19 at 3 at office of Kilsby, Cheapside

Simmons, John, Manchester, Earthenware Dealer. March 10 at 3 at office of Shippey, Cooper st, Manchester

Skymaker, Adolphus Frederick, Centre row, Covent garden Market. March 9 at 12 at offices of Bartlett and Forbes, Bedford st, Covent garden

Slee, William, Braunton, Devon, Mason. March 14 at 2 at offices of Benecraft, Bouthport st, Barnetpale

Smith, Samuel, Burton-on-Trent, Stafford, Publican. March 14 at 2 at office of Stevenson and Smith, Burton-on-Trent

Soden, John, Middle Barton, Oxford, Nurseryman. March 9 at 12 at office of Stocken and Jupp, Leadenhall st. Searse, Oxford

Tate, James, and Alfred Tate, Leeds, Boot Manufacturers. March 11 at 1 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, Bear lane, Leeds

Taylor, Alfred Cockill, Wexbury, Wilts, Chemist. March 17 at 1 at the Lopes Arms Hotel, Westbury. Chapman and Posing, Warrminster

Thomas, Thomas David, and John Thomas, Liverpool, Drapers. March 16 at 3 at offices of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st, Liverpool

Thomson, William Frederick, Manchester, Grocer. March 13 at 3 at office of Sampson, South King st, Manchester

Thompson, James, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Stationary. March 16 at 11 at Reader and Son, Temple st, Aylesbury

Turner, William, Bury Saint Edmund's, Suffolk, Boot Maker. March 17 at 12 at the Guildhall, Bury Saint Edmund's. Salmon and Son

Verne, Philip Alzernon, and Frederick Henry Gooding, Borough High st, Seed Merchants. March 12 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st. Sandom and Kersey

Virgo, John Brumley, York, Butler. March 13 at 3 at office of Holthby, New st, York

Walker, Henry, Manchester, Baker. March 17 at 4 at office of Diggle, Cooper st, Manchester

Ward, Thomas, Bradford, York, Basket Maker. March 13 at 11 at office of Burnley, Queensgate, Bradford

Waring, Joshua, Lichfield, Lancashire, Grocer. March 10 at 11 at office of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackburn

Watkins, Jonathan Fowler, Weymouth, Dorset, Butcher. March 16 at 12 at the Auction Mart, Market st, Weymouth. Howard, Weymouth

Williamson, Thomas, Pembroke Dock, Pembroke, Fishmonger. March 9 at 10.15 at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Parry, Pembroke Dock

Wright, Thomas, Manchester, Woollen Warehouseman. March 16 at 3 at offices of Adiechaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

TUESDAY, March 5, 1874.

Ansty, Thomas, Southampton, Coach Builder. March 13 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House, Gresham st, Stanton

Baker, Edwin, Bride st, Liverpool rd, Grocer. March 23 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Islington. Heathfield, Lincoln's inn field

Barrell, James, Buckfastleigh, Devon, Boot Maker. March 14 at 11 at office of Curteis, St George's Hall, East Stonehouse

Benson, Charles, Bloxham, Oxford, Horse Dealer. March 17 at 11 at offices of Kirby and Son, Banbury

Botes, Richard, Bedford, York, Hostler. March 13 at 11 at offices of Watson and Dickson, Victoria chambers, Market st, Bradford

Bradley, William, Kingsbrompton, Somerset, Draper. March 14 at 2 at the London and South Western Hotel, Paul st, Exeter. Rogers, Exeter

Brooks, David, Ash grove, Hackney, Builder. March 11 at 12 at office of Hudgell, Gresham st. Gray, Gresham st

Bryde, Thomas, Liscard, Cheshire, Stevedore. March 16 at 3 at office of Brathwaite, Presoon's row, South Castle st, Liverpool. Anderson, Birkenhead

Bullock, Thomas, Birmingham, Commission Agent. March 11 at 3 at office of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Burton, William, Little Sutton, Warwick, Licensed Victualler. March 9 at 4 at office of Parry, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Chapman, Charles, Little Hay, Stafford, Wheelwright. March 16 at 11 at office of Stanley, Bridge st, Walsall

Clarke, James, Spring place, Wandsworth rd, Marine Store Dealer. March 12 at 11 at office of Hunter, London wall. Ede, Ludgate hill

Clarke, Thomas, Holt, Worcester, Fruiterer. March 11 at 3 at office of Tree, Salisbury st, Worcester

Cook, John, Dunstable, Bedford, Painter. March 17 at 12 at offices of Middleton, Magistrate's Clerk's Office, Dunstable

Cooper, Thomas, Kirbymoorside, York, Rural Post Messenger. March 17 at 1 at the White Horse Inn, Kirbymoorside. Pearson, Helmsley

Courtelle, Eugene, Upper Baker st, Marylebone, Hair Dresser. March 20 at 3 at office of Curdwell, Colleges hill, Cannon st

Crowther, Thomas Edward, Brighouse, York, Piano-forte Dealer. March 12 at 11 at 6, John st, Bedford row. Storey, Halifax

Cudridge, Thomas Mitchell, Lilleshall rd, Clapham, out of business. March 13 at 1 at office of Perry, Ludgate hill

Dore, Thomas James, Waterloo rd, Carrier. March 11 at 2 at offices of Gowing, Coleman st

Edwards, William, Blodfield, Norfolk, Farm Steward. March 16 at 12 at offices of Emerson and Sparrow, Rampant st, Norwich

Elby, Thomas James, Bethesda, Carnarvon, Gas Manufacturer. March 12 at 1 at the Castle Hotel, Bangor. Barber and Hughes, Bangor

Evans, Enoch Hugh, Lampeter, Cardigan, Agent. March 14 at 1 at offices of Green and Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen

Evans, Thomas, Swansea, Glamorgan, Builder. March 13 at 11 at offices of Davies and Hartland, Rutland st, Swansea

Fenton, Albert, and Samuel Wilson, Radcliffe, Worcester, Needle Manufacturers. March 13 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, New st, Birmingham

Gaunt, Joseph Henry, Pudsey, York, Draper. March 17 at 12 at office of Fiallan, Park row, Leeds

George, Thomas Daniel, Swansea, Glamorgan, Painter. March 19 at 2 at the White Lion Hotel, Broad st, Bristol. Woodward

Gould, James, Sandy hill, Plumstead, Grocer. March 13 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Charing Cross

Green, Frederic, Long Eaton, Derby, Tailor. March 20 at 12 at offices of Parsons and Bright, Eldon chambers, Wheeler gate, Nottingham

Griffiths, William, Birmingham, Greengrocer. March 13 at 12 at office of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Groom, Ebenezer, Auckland st, Vauxhall, Cheesemonger. March 12 at 3 at office of Cooper, Charing Cross

Hallett, Francis Henry, Trowbridge, Wilts, Brickmaker. March 16 at 12 at offices of Rodway, Fore st, Trowbridge

Hambridge, Charles, Guilford, Russell square, Surveyor. March 16 at 11 at offices of Chorley and Crawford, Moorgate st

Hammond, William, Lewes, Sussex, Upholsterer. March 10 at 12 at 33, Gutter lane, Stuckey, Brighton

Harris, Edwin Douglas, Landport, Southampton, Butcher. March 12 at 4 at offices of Paice, Commercial rd, Landport. King, Portsea

Harris, Francis Joseph, Kentish Town rd, Ironmonger. March 21 at 3 at office of Boydell, South square, Gray's inn

Harrison, Philip, Ipswich, Suffolk, Grocer. March 14 at 11 at offices of Watia, Butcher market, Ipswich

Hartley, Ezra Brown, and James Walker, Leeds, Woollen Manufacturers. March 16 at 2 at office of Simpson and Barrell, Aloia st, Leeds

Harvard, Robert Appleton Charles, Houndsditch, Toy Merchant. March 21 at 12 at offices of Flux and Leadbitter, Leadenhall st

Heap, John, New Inn yard, Shoreditch, Flock Merchant. March 21 at 11 at office of Hutson, Clifton st, Finsbury

Helliwell, George, Hackenhorpe, Derby, S. the Manufacturer. March 12 at 12 at office of Macdon, Bank st, Sheffield

Holland, Richard, Salford, Lancashire, Book Keeper. March 19 at 4 at office of Best, Brown st, Manchester

Hutcliffe, Charles, Birmingham, Fish Merchant. March 13 at 3 at office of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Jeffreys, John, Upper Grange rd, Bermanssey, Dairyman. March 11 at 11 at the Five Balls Coffee Room, Bermanssey square

Jones, John Allin, Jun, Birmingham, Earth Closet Manufacturer. March 13 at 11 at offices of Webb and Spencer, New st, Birmingham

Lambert, Sarah, Chipstead, Kent, Baker. March 12 at 12 at offices of Holcroft and Co, Sevenoaks

Langdon, James Henry, Hart st, Mark lane, Commission Agent. March 20 at 2 at office of Hilbery, Crutched fians

Lawrence, Alexander, Birmingham, Saddler. March 16 at 12 at the Hen and Chickens Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Eaden, Birmingham

Lawry, John, Burlington, York, Butcher. March 16 at 3 at the Black Lion Inn, Burlington. Jarrett and Turner, Driffield

Lett, Barnabas, Worcester, Bath Proprietor. March 20 at 11 at offices of Corbett, Avenue House, The Cross

Love, Thomas, Barlow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Builder. March 11 at 3 at offices of Gooden, Brazenose st, Manchester

Lucas, George, Milton-next-Sittingbourne, Kent Outfitter. March 18 at 11 at the Mason's Hall Tavern, Mason's avenue. Winch, Chatham

Marsden, Harry Alexander, Leeds, Draper. March 13 at 12 at offices of Pullan, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds

Mangham, Thomas, Clapham rd, Mineral Water Manufacturer. March 13 at 3 at offices of Nicholls and Leatherdale, Old Jewry chambers

McArthur, Peter, East Ham, Essex, Licensed Victualler. March 17 at 3 at offices of Rawlings, Bishopsgate st Within

McPherson, Robert, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Tobacconist. March 24 at 12 at office of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Morris, Thomas, Bangor, Carnarvon, Tailor. March 14 at 12 at the Liverpool Arms Hotel, Chester. Roberts, Bangor

Moulde, Joseph, Little Gonerby, Grantham, Lincoln, Joiner. March 17 at 1 at the Angel Hotel, Grantham. Belk, Nottingham

Muddymann, William, Birmingham, Greengrocer. March 19 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Nice, Henry Edward, High st, Stratford, Cheesemonger. March 13 at 10 at office of Hope, Soile st, Lincoln's-inn-field

Perry, Frederic Augustus, Westbromwich, Stafford, Grocer. March 17 at 2 at office of Travis, Church lane, Tipton

Poole, Thomas George Bruce, Hastings, Sussex, Builder. March 17 at 11 at office of Howell, Jun, Havelock rd, Hastings

Pooley, Alexander Russell, Bush lane, Cannon st, Financial Agent. March 16 at 12 at office of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury square

Potter, Thomas, Matlock Bridge, Derby, Painter. March 17 at 12 at office of Hextall, Albert st, Derby

Pugh, John, Wichenford, near Worcester, Grocer. March 11 at 11 at offices of Foster, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Redfearn, Joe William, and John Shaw Redfearn, Huddersfield, Woollen Manufacturers. March 16 at 3.30 at offices of Clough and Son, Market st, Huddersfield

Reed, Henry Wilson, Cleveland square, Hyde Park, Surgeon. March 13 at 3 at office of Wetherfield, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st

Reed, John Sherwill, Newton Abbot, Devon, Innkeeper. March 20 at 12 at offices of Carter and Son, Cary buildings, Abbey rd, Torquay

Rees, Daniel, Ystrad, near Pontypridd, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 14 at 1 at offices of Simons and Fiers, Church st, Merthyr Tydfil

Phys, Charles Oulton, Hill st, Rutland Gate, Law Student. March 13 at 12 at offices of Beyfay and Beyur, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Roberts, John, Redruth, Cornwall, Draper. March 14 at 2.30 at office of Downing, Redruth

Roddy, Owen, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Hatter. March 23 at 12 at offices of Johnston, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Rowlands, Henry, and Charles Edward Cowie, Birmingham, Chandelier Manufacturers. March 12 at 3 at the Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st, Birmingham. Rooks, Birmingham

Ryder, Thomas, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Boot Manker. March 9 at 12 at office of Potter, Northfield House, North place, Cheltenham

Seed, James, Habergham Eaves, Lancashire, Farmer. March 20 at 3 at 10, Nicholas st, Burnley. Hartley

Skinner, Samuel, Harrogate, York, Contractor. March 19 at 2 at office of Harle, Victoria chambers, South parade, Leeds

Smith, Charles, Cold Harbour lane, Brixton, Builder. March 17 at 11 at offices of Tippetts and Co, Great St Thomas Apostle

Spocking, Samuel, Birmingham, Butcher. March 16 at 11 at offices of Perry, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Taylor, Henry George Moffatt, Greville rd, Kilburn, no trade. March 17 at 3 at office of Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st

Thomas, James, Chalford, Gloucester, Grocer. March 16 at 11 at the Swan Inn, Stroud. Smith

Thorpe, Thomas Ed ward, and Joseph Henry Swaine, Woodhouse Carr, Leeds, Dyers. March 17 at 3.30 at office of Middleton and Sons, Park row, Leeds

Turner, Ann, Halifax, York, Grocer. March 13 at 3 at office of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax

Tuater, John, Goybrey, Monmouth, Farm Bailiff. March 19 at 11 at offices of Watkins, Pontypool

Tyas, Amos, Kirkheaton, near Huddersfield, Fancy Woollen Manufacturer. March 16 at 11 at offices of Barker and Sons, Estate buildings, Huddersfield

Tyerman, John, Nottingham, Scaleboard Cutter. March 17 at 12 at offices of Brittle, St Peter's chambers, St Peter's gate, Nottingham

Vickery, William, Bridport, Dorset, Ironmonger. March 14 at offices of Hancock and Co, Bristol (in lieu of the place originally named)

Waldy, Charles Richard William, Gussage A/I Saints, Dorset, Clerk in Holy Orders. March 23 at 11 at office of Rawlings, Eastbrook, Wimbome Minster

Walsh, Henry, Manchester, Poultry Dealer. March 16 at 3 at offices of Heath and Sons, Swan st, Manchester

Watson, William, Pallion, Sunderland, Iron Shipbuilder. March 16 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Fawcett st, Sunderland. Robinson, Sunderland

Watts, William, Norwich, Match Manufacturer. March 16 at 12 at offices of Emerson and Sparrow, Rampant Horse st, Norwich

Wells, Thomas, Collingwood st, Mile End, China dealer. March 17 at 10 at offices of Goatey, Westminster bridge rd

Whitehead, William, Basset st, Hackney rd, Boot maker. March 24 at 2 at offices of Lind, Beaufort buildings, Strand

Whitehouse, John, Northfield, Worcester, Farmer. March 16 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Whitfield, Samuel, Sutton, Salop, Farmer. March 20 at 3 at the George Hotel, Shrewsbury. Richards

Wiessner, Leopold Moitz, Churton st, Pimlico, Jeweller. March 17 at 11, at offices of Thorp, Cranbourn st, Leicester square

Wrightman, Samuel Radford, Nottingham, Hosiery Manufacturer. March 16 at 12 at offices of Hogz, Wheeler cars

Williams, John Nicholas, Ramsgate, Kent, Mariner. March 16 at 3, at offices of Treherne and Wolfertan, Edgimham st, Ramsgate

Williams, Robert, Llanrwst, Denbigh, Hotel Keeper. March 11 at 12 at the Eagles Hotel, Llanrwst. James, Tynnyrwent, Llanrwst

Williamson, George, High st, Hoxton, Butcher. March 16 at 11, at office of Plunkett, Gutter lane

Wilson, William, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. March 14 at 12 at offices of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol

FUNERAL REFORM.—The exorbitant items of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which survivors may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, 3 Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.—Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 2s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Danes Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June, 18, 1864, 540 page.

The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint), vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

IMPROVED AND ECONOMIC COOKERY.—Use LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT as "stock" for beef-tea, soups, made dishes and sauces; gives fine flavor and great strength. Invariably adopted in households when fairly tried. CAUTION.—Genuine only with Baron Liebig's facsimile across label.

MANSION HOUSE BENGAL FAMINE RELIEF FUND.

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
HER MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY THE QUEEN,
Who contributes £1,000, and
H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES,
Who subscribes £500.

LONDON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
The Right Hon. ANDREW LUSH, M.P., Lord Mayor,
Chairman.

The Right Hon. Lord Lawrence	Mr. John Borrodalle
Mr. N. de Rothschild, M.P.	Mr. Hugh Matheson
Hon. R. Bourke, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs	Mr. Dudley Smith
Mr. C. B. Denison, M.P.	Mr. John Fleming, C.S.I.
Sir Albert Sassoon, K.S.I.	Mr. Wm. Grant
Mr. E. C. Baring	Mr. F. W. Heilgers
Mr. Alderman Allen	Mr. W. Dent
(With power to add to their number.)	Mr. A. T. J. Petersen
	Mr. J. N. Bullen

CALCUTTA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
Hon. Mr. SCALCH, President.

Hon. Mr. Inglis	Hon. Raja Jotendro Moha
Hon. Mr. Daiyell	Tagore.
Hon. Mr. Sutcliff	Mr. J. Bullen Smith
Hon. Dignambar Mitra	Munstri Amir Ali Khan
Hon. Mr. Robinson	Babu Durga Chara Law

The LORD MAYOR and the LONDON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPEAL with confidence for the SYMPATHY and LIBERALITY of the British Public in their efforts to mitigate the rigours of the calamity with which our unfortunate fellow subjects in Bengal and other parts of India are now visited.

The funds subscribed will be devoted to the alleviation of distress which cannot easily be reached by Governmental interferences.

The Viceroy of India, in his telegram to the Lord Mayor of the 23rd ult., states: "The people of the distressed districts will gratefully appreciate the sympathy and liberality of the English nation;" and that there is urgent need for all the aid which it is in the power of this country to afford is but too clearly manifested by the concluding words of the telegram sent by the Chairman of the Central Relief Committee at Calcutta: "The distress is likely to be very severe. Subscriptions are solicited early."

Subscriptions may be forwarded to the Lord Mayor, or the following banks: The Imperial Bank, Lombard, E.C.; Messrs. Glyn, Mills, and Co., Lombard-street; Messrs. Coutts and Co., 59, Strand; Messrs. Herries, Farquhar, and Co., St. James's-street, S.W.; and National Bank of India, 80, King William-street. Cash payments should be made in the office of the Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor (Mr. Vine), at the Mansion House.

JOHN R. S. VINE, Secretary.
G. J. W. WINZAR, Cashier.

March 5th, 1874.

LEGAL EDUCATION.—MR. T. DE COURCY ATKINS, Student to the Four Inns of Court, and late reader in Roman Law at University College, has formed classes for the study of the subjects required for the various examinations (1874) of the Inns of Court, the Incorporated Law Society, and the London University. Private pupils are received for the systematic study of all branches of English Law and General Jurisprudence.—For particulars apply at 3, New-square, Lincoln's-inn.

YATES & ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,
ETC.

SYMONDS INN, 22, CHANCERY-LANE,
LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Chancery Bills and Answers	Catalogues
Appeals	Prospectuses
Parliamentary Minutes	Magazines
Books	Newspapers
Pamphlets	Circulars
Reports	Posters
Rule	Handbills, &c., &c.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION
BAKER-STREET.—Great Attractions.—The CARRIAGE used by NAPOLEON III. at Metz, Châlons, and Sedan, with numerous relics of the campaign of 1870. Portrait Models of MARSHAL BAZAINE and McMAHON, M. THIERS, FRANCIS JOSEPH of AUSTRIA, and the SHAH of PERSIA, with the original autograph and testimonial presented to Madame Tussaud and Sons, July 3rd, 1873, as a souvenir of His Imperial Majesty's visit, are now added; also, new superb and costly Court dresses. Admission, 1s. Children under ten, 6d. Extra rooms, 6d. Open from 10 a.m. till 10 p.m.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—Travellers' Safety.—TWO new LECTURES—the first, SAFETY AT SEA (in which will be discussed the best method of lowering boats); the second lecture, SAFETY ON LAND (in which railway matters will be discussed) will shortly follow. Mr. Howard Paul during the week. Jane Compton. Sugar and the Silver Light, by Professor Gardner. Domestic Electricity, Mr. King. Other entertainments. Open 19 and 7. Admission 1s.